The Mennonite Quarterly Review

Volume XXIX July 1955 Number Three

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL 170

THE CONFESSIONS OF FAITH OF THE DUTCH MENNONITES 171
N. van der Zijpp

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE MENNONITE "HOF" OF THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY PALATINATE INTO THE MENNONITE CHURCHES OF PFALZ-RHEINLAND TODAY 188
Gerhard Hein

THE MENNONITE APPROACH TO WORSHIP, AND CURRENT TRENDS 197
Elmer M Ediger

THE ANABAPTISTS ANSWER MELANCHTHON 212
(I). The *Handbüchlein* of 1558
Wilhelm Wiswedel
(II). Some Further Studies pertaining to the *Handbüchlein* of 1558
Robert Friedmann

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL AND RESEARCH NOTES 232
THE ANABAPTISTS IN ENGLISH LITERATURE: A RESEARCH NOTE
Irvin B. Horst

BOOK REVIEWS 240
Winthrop Hudson, *The Great Tradition of the American Churches*
Reviewed by J. Lawrence Burkholder
George W. Forell, *Faith Active in Love*
Reviewed by William Klassen
William A. Mueller, *Church and State in Luther and Calvin. A Comparative Study*
Reviewed by Paul Peachey
Walter Quiring, *Im Schweisse Deines Angesichts. Ein Bilderbuch der Mennoniten*
Reviewed by J. Winfield Fretz

EDITORIAL

THE ANABAPTIST-MENNONITE MOVEMENT HAS NOT BEEN HISTORICALLY A creedal church, certainly not in the sense that the major Protestant and Catholic bodies are creedal. Yet the Mennonite bodies in all countries have produced confessions and for the most part still use them, even though neither candidates for baptism nor candidates for ordination are commonly called upon to bind themselves to a confession. Since the very first Anabaptists did not have official creeds how are the later Mennonite confessions to be explained? How did they arise and what function did they have? In other words what is the philosophy of Mennonite confessions?

The valuable treatment by N. van der Zijpp in this issue on the history of Dutch Mennonite confessions is the first scholarly study in this field. The Dutch Mennonites were the first to have confessions, and most of the confessions used by Mennonites in other countries are either direct reprints of these confessions or were drafted under their influence. According to the author the 16th century Anabaptists had no confessions because they felt the Bible was sufficient and also because they were afraid of the tyranny of a confession. Yet they did finally in the following century produce numerous confessions; not the typical comprehensive, theological creeds of the state churches, but general doctrinal statements covering the major points at issue between various Mennonite groups as well as between Mennonites as a whole and the state church. Most of the earlier 17th century confessions were drafted as a basis for the reunion of divided groups. Later, after a temporary eclipse of confessions, there was a revival in their use by those who were battling against the inroads of spiritualism, Collegiantism, and Socinianism. In modern times most Dutch Mennonites are set hard against any confession because of what they consider to be the danger of the tyranny of a confession over the individual. Van der Zijpp's history of the Dutch confessions throws much light on the spiritual history of the Dutch Mennonites. But the last word has not yet been written on the spiritual history of Anabaptist-Mennonitism, and similar studies are certainly needed in the history of the movement in other countries. The author's interpretation of the history of Dutch confessions is in itself a part of the spiritual history of brotherhood. It is an intensely interesting and enlightening paper, demonstrating the author's mastery of the field. The REVIEW takes pleasure in congratulating him on his appointment as lecturer in Mennonite History at the Dutch Mennonite Theological Seminary in Amsterdam.

THE FIRST AREA IN WHICH THE MENNONITES OF SWITZERLAND-SOUTH GERMANY were permitted open public assembly and at least a partial organization was in the Palatinate area to which they had emigrated from Switzerland from about 1650 on. It is most interesting to observe the change in the forms of organizations of their group life which developed in their area in the following two hundred years. Fortunately sufficient sources have survived to permit a reliable tracing of this evolution, as Pastor Gerhard Hein of Sembach, one of the oldest Mennonite congregations in the Palatinate, has done in his historical essay, "The Development of the Mennonite *Hof* of the 17th Century Palatinate into the Mennonite Churches of the Pfalz-Rheinland Today." Since the early Pennsylvania Mennonite settlers, who established the Mennonite church in America from 1707 on, came largely from the Palatinate, it is of much interest to note the divergent development in the New World, due certainly in large part to the religious and economic freedom here.

WITH THEIR INCREASING OPENNESS TO OUTSIDE INFLUENCES AMERICAN Mennonites are feeling the pull of current trends in Protestantism in patterns of worship including architecture. One of these trends, a very strong one indeed, is that toward an altar-centered chancel with the side-pulpit and lectern.

(Continued on page 239)

The Mennonite Quarterly Review

THE CONFESSIONS OF FAITH OF THE DUTCH MENNONITES

N. VAN DER ZIJPP

From the year 1591, when they signed the Concept of Cologne, until the year 1766, when Cornelis Ris published his "Confessions of the True Mennonites," a total of nine statements of faith were issued by the Dutch Mennonites. The nature and plan of these writings differed; also the circumstances that led to their publication differed; and also the appreciation and reception they found differed.

One of the first things to strike one about these confessions is that they came out in a relatively late period. The Swiss Brethren never came out with a written confession: similar was the case with the Dutch Anabaptists, who only after the end of 60 years of the movement published something like a confession.

One might refer to the "Resolutions of Wismar," some nine decrees laid down in 1554 by the Convent of Elders in this city of Mecklenburg; resolutions which certainly had their importance for our Mennonites. But these resolutions do not form a proper confession. They merely regulate the life of the congregation.[1] More

* N. van der Zijpp is pastor of the Mennonite Church at Rotterdam, Netherlands, and Lecturer in Mennonite History in the Mennonite Theological Seminary at Amsterdam. He is also an assistant editor of *The Mennonite Encyclopedia*, and a contributing editor of *The Mennonite Quarterly Review*. This paper was delivered by the author as a public lecture at the University of Amsterdam on November 16, 1954, upon his acceptance of the position of Lecturer at the seminary of the Algemeene Doopsgezinde Societeit. It has been published in the Dutch language at Haarlem. The English translation here published is by Jan Gleijsteen.

1 The *Besluiten van Wismar* are to be found in K. Vos, *Menno Simons* (Leiden, 1914) 123-27. They deal with the ban, outside marriage (i.e., marriage with non-Mennonites), litigation in secular courts, nonresistance, and that nobody may preach on his own authority (without the permission of the convent of elders).

rightly one could consider "The Brotherly Union of Some Children of God Regarding Seven Articles," a Dutch translation of a German writing, published in 1560, as a confession.[2] But the disorderly manner in which the articles are classified by the Southern German leaders, and above all the fact that what is said about baptism, excommunication, the breaking of the bread, nonconformity to the world, the overseers of the congregation, the sword and the oath, is directed especially toward the practices of congregational life, makes this writing, after all, still different from a confession.

Then to which confession did the numerous Anabaptist martyrs refer? To none, simply because no written confession was available to them. When some of them were given the occasion by the inquisitors, or sometimes forced to present a confession, then they composed one themselves, as for instance Jaques d'Auchy or Jeronimus Segersz[3] did, and as Hans de Ries also did later when he was captured in Middelburg in 1578 and had to give an explanation of his beliefs.[4] This very same de Ries had drafted a confession the year before in co-operation with the group known as Waterlanders.[5]

Is this then the first Anabaptist confession in Holland? Yes and no: Yes in the sense that here was the first attempt to formulate the faith according to the convictions existing in this group. Neither Menno Simons nor Dirk Philips has given us such a summary. But No in the sense that this does not constitute a binding confession. "The writers did not want to express more than their own conviction. Congenial brothers could take notice of their wording and upon agreement, unite with them," says Kühler.[6] The results were slight, the more so because the piece was not printed, but only circulated in handwritten copies.

What is the reason that the old Dutch Anabaptists did not have any printed confessions, and that they waited until the beginning of the seventeenth century—the Concept of Cologne can hardly be called a confession—before they decided to redact one? Could we blame it on the severe persecutions that the Anabaptists endured in our country until about 1570 and the unstable conditions that resulted from the persecutions?

2 *The Brüderliche Vereynigung etzlicher kinder Gottes sieben Artickel betreffend* was adopted in 1527 at Schleitheim (north of Schaffhausen); the Dutch translation is reprinted in *Bibliotheca Reformatoria Neerlandica V* (The Hague 1909) 605-13.

3 The confession of Jaques d'Auchy, who was drowned at Leeuwarden in 1559, in *Offer des Heeren, Bibl. Reform. Neerl.* II (1904) 268-73. In the same work, p. 129, Jeronimus Segersz, burned at the city of Antwerp in 1551, says "My confession" was read.

4 W. J. Kühler, *Geschiedenis der Nederl, Doopsgezinden in de 16de eeuw* (Haarlem, 1932) 358.

5 About this first confession of de Ries see S. Blaupot ten Cate, *Geschiedenis der Doopsgezinden in Holland* I (Amsterdam, 1847) 385-89; E. M. ten Cate, "De eerste Doopsgezinde Belijdenis," in *Doopsgezinde Bijdragen*, 1904, 134-59.

6 Kühler, *op. cit.*, 354.

Does the lack of a confession go together with the character of the early Anabaptist movement, which—even though it is not necessary to accept the conclusion of K. Vos and his most recent follower, A. F. Mellink, that its followers were drawn from the "scum of the people"[7]—most certainly for the largest part consisted of middle-class people for whom the intellectual considerations and precise formulation of values and doctrines was not a need of the first order?

Did it rise from the fact that in Anabaptist circles there were only a few leaders and among these only a few were schooled theologians?

Was it, as Hoekstra says, "Because their doctrines excluded all representative authority of elders and teachers in matters of faith"?[8]

Or is the lack of a binding confession to be explained by the absence of a central administrative body which, like the Synod of the Dutch Reformed Church, could draft and approve a confession?

All these questions can be answered in the affirmative. All these above factors no doubt contributed to the fact that no confession came into being. But these are after all only secondary causes. The real reason is quite different; namely, that the early Anabaptists did not have a confession because they did not want any.

Why not? Because, as Galenus Abrahamsz once expressed it, the Holy Scripture was the only foundation and only rule of faith. Confessions never could be binding, however Scriptural they might be, since these are based on the best knowledge and insight of the originators.[9] Here I quoted Galenus, since he opposed the growing confessionalism among the Mennonites most grimly and fundamentally.[10] But his view was not new, as some of his contemporaries insinuated.[11] The martyrs did not refer to confessions—they could not because none existed—and neither did they want to, since God's Word was sufficient for them. The martyr Jaques d'Auchy, mentioned above, said in his cross-examination that he in no way founded his beliefs on Anselmus and Augustinus; neither Calvin nor Zwingli counted as authorities, nor did Menno Simons.[12] And if we read about Theunis van Hastenrath: "He read Menno Simons' books, yet

7 K. Vos, "Revolutionaire Hervorming," in *"De Gids,"* IV (1920) 439; A. F. Mellink, *De Wederdopers in de Noordelijke Nederlanden* (Groningen, 1954) 363 ff.

8 S. Hoekstra Bzn, *Beginselen en Leer der oude Doopsgezinden vergeleken met die der overige Protestanten* (Amsterdam, 1863) 128.

9 H. W. Meihuizen, *Galenus Abrahamsz* (Haarlem, 1954) 69.

10 Meihuizen, *ibid.*, pictures him as "a defender of unlimited tolerance and Anabaptist spiritualism."

11 We find this accusation already in one of the very first pamphlets against Galenus, namely, the (anonymous) *Commonitio often Werschouwinge aen de Vlaemsche Doopsgesinde Gemeynte binnen Amsterdam* by a *Voorstander, ja een Lidtmaet derselve Gemeynte, uit 1655.* This accusation was repeated regularly from then on.

12 *Offer des Heeren,* 274 f., 283, 292, 311.

he got it from the New Testament"[13]—then we find here and likewise with numerous other martyrs[14] that they desired only God's guidance, and not man's. They did not need advice. Over against the doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church that only the church is authorized and able to interpret the Bible stood their firm conviction that they were individually able to understand God's Word: "God has taken away the cover from their eyes and their heart."[15] They knew themselves to "be of age" in their beliefs.[16] For this reason they did not need a written confession, since this would bind their conscience. In 1596, at the colloquy held at Leeuwarden, Pieter van Ceulen, the Mennonite orator, brought the charge against Acronius, his Dutch Reformed opponent, that the questions to be asked of those who wanted to partake of the Lord's Supper for the first time, approved by the Dordt Synod in 1578, assaulted the conscience and even held authority above God's Word.[17] So they refused confessions. One can call it naivete; one can say, "All right, they wanted personal devoutness, not tied down to a fixed religion; they wanted to determine their attitude toward the Bible through personal, individual obedience"; yet does this mean that nevertheless in some way or other they had to come to a fixed formulation? When Menno Simons rated "an unadulterated, pure teaching"[18] first among the marks of a true brotherhood, and in 1581 when the more liberal Waterlanders decided, "The teachers shall sometimes when they preach in a congregation give a short confession and declaration of faith, and also recite the ordinances of a Christian Church,"[19] does not this indicate a choice, a frame, a formulation, a fixation? That is certainly the case. After all, one cannot deny that even in a congregation of the most pronounced individualists one must have a certain like-mindedness of opinion to make communication possible. Without such a basis even the spiritualistic Galenus Abrahamsz could not have been a preacher of the 't Lam congregation at Amsterdam.

But still this is different from prescribing to each other what to believe. It is important after all that where Christ is head of the church, the members do not bind each other; that the hand does not try to make all the members of the body into hands, neither the foot

13 *Doopsgez. Bijdragen,* 1909, 124.

14 For instance, the martyrs Adriaen Cornelis, Joos Kint, and Peter Witses clearly reported by Claesken, executed at Leeuwarden in 1559, "I do not stand on Gielis (in this case the Elder Gillis van Aken), nor on any other man, but on Christ alone" (*Offer des Heeren,* 327).

15 *Offer des Heeren,* 451.

16 About this "being of age," see H. W. Meihuizen in *Algemeen Doopsgezind Weekblad,* V (June 9, 1951).

17 *Protocol des Ghesprecx tot Leeuwarden* (1598) 131b, 132a.

18 Menno Simons, *Opera Omnia* (Amsterdam, 1691) 300b.

19 *Doopsgez. Bijdragen,* 1877, 81.

into feet.[20] The great danger which the Mennonites saw in setting up a confession was the danger of the tyranny of such a confession. Apart from the other objection, namely, that a confession never does full justice to the Biblical message nor adequately interprets it, they understood that a binding confession in the hands of men easily becomes a weapon which causes deadly wounds. For confession and strict discipline are inseparable. The seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Mennonites have painfully experienced that.

However, the Dutch Mennonites gradually got their confessions. Originally, and even later on, they were not meant to be binding confessions. They did not want to prescribe what one had to believe, but simply describe that which was commonly believed. It was always emphasized that the confessions were "subject to the Word of God."[21]

The Mennonites became divided by heavy schisms and divisions; each of the groups had a leaning toward calling itself the true church of Christ. But very soon the conviction grew that the divisions should not continue to exist; on May 1, 1591, the representatives of the Frisians and the High Germans met at Cologne and "together in brotherly love examined the articles of faith and Christian ordinances of the congregations: and since we did not discover any difference or divine cause to hinder our peace, . . . we have on both sides accepted each other as dear beloved Brethren . . ."—this is in the introduction to the Concept of Cologne.[22] The Concept proper consists almost entirely of practical rules regarding excommunication, marriage, admission to the Lord's Supper, footwashing, oaths, the rejection of usury, and nonresistance.

Consequently it can be said that this "confession" was only a means to reunite two separated groups. The same could be said about most of the confessions following. Thus the confessions of Hans de Ries and Lubbert Gerritsz in 1610 became the foundation for the reunion of the Waterlanders at Amsterdam with a part of the Brownists under John Smith at that place.[23] So also the confession of Jan Cents in 1630 signified the beginning of the successful negotiations between some two groups of Mennonites at Amsterdam; the

20 I Cor. 12:12 ff.

21 Introduction to the *Algemeene Belydenissen*, 1665. Hans de Ries wrote in 1626 (*Apologia*, 36): "The Confession is but a limited conception of what we feel the Word of God to be, in contrast to others who also profess to keep to the Holy Scriptures. And is this to be binding? We say no; it is subject to improvement."

22 This introduction, not included in the *Algemeene Belydenissen* (Amsterdam, 1665), is to be found in one edition of the *Concept* (Vlissingen, 1666).

23 The reunion became reality in 1615. John Smyth had died in the meantime. The other Brownists, who did not agree to the fusion with the Waterlanders, returned shortly thereafter to England. There, out of this group, originated the General Baptists. Several congregations in England later on tried to keep in touch with the Dutch Mennonites. See J. G. de Hoop Scheffer, *History of the Free Churchmen* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1922) *passim*.

confession of Adriaan Cornelis effected the amalgamation of a greater part of the Flemish Mennonites with the Old Flemish Mennonites, which decision was made at an assembly at Dordrecht in 1632.

I have not yet referred to the "Christian Confession of Faith of the Olive Branch, or Scriptural direction as to which people has the peace of God upon it, and also how the same are required and bound to peace and understanding, etc." Here we see very clearly what purpose such a Mennonite confession had. The ministers (*Dienaaren,* i.e., preachers) of the United Flemish congregation (bij 't Lam) at Amsterdam sent out, in 1626, three questions: (*a*) What are the fundamental and certain signs by which the children of God and the members of the body of Christ (being God's church) can be recognized? *(b)* Whether the Flemish alone possess these marks; *(c)* Whether the making of peace with others is forbidden. The preachers themselves set to work to answer their three questions, the answers to which appeared in print in 1624. It was to be foreseen that the second and third questions were answered in the negative: the only true church is not to be found only with the Flemish; the making of peace is in no way forbidden, but is even explicitly commanded by God. Thus they wrote in the concluding chapter of the "Olive Branch," which bears the characterizing title, "Letter to the preparation of Peace."[24] In it we also read the following: "Misusing the Scriptures on both sides, they cry out, 'We alone are the true church'—therefore it is no wonder that during internal disputes one hears, as in the church of Corinth, 'I belong to Paul,' 'I belong to Apollo,' 'I belong to Cephas,' and nowadays, 'I belong to the Frisians' and 'I belong to the Flemish.' This is not right. Therefore let us prevent further schisms and excommunications and heal the wounds." We see that the composition of the "Olive Branch" had the same purpose as with the above confessions, namely, to give a description of that which is commonly believed and accepted among them and thereby inviting others to check whether they had other insights on this and if not, to unite with them.

For the sake of completeness I must mention two other confessions, namely, that which Syvaert Pietersz and Pieter Jansz Twisck placed in the Old Frisian edition (1617) of the great Martyr Book, and the one of Jaques Outerman, the Haarlem elder of the Flemish (1626). The first was only a statement by two private persons without any approval of their congregations. It was not a confession, because of the contents, since there is little more said than that the

24 This letter to *Vreed-Bereydinge* does not appear in the *Algemeene Belydenissen* (Amsterdam, 1665), but is found in a booklet called *Handelinge der Ver-eenigde Vlaemse en Duytse Doops-gesinde Gemeynten* (Vlissingen, 1666), 27-38.

congregation has to keep itself to the ordinances and doctrines of the forefathers, especially those of Menno Simons and Dirk Philips.

As far as the confession of Outerman is concerned, this was also in fact a private confession. Outerman was accused of Socinianism, and had to account for this to the authorities. Thus on October 8, 1626, he presented to the deputies of the Court of Holland his "Confession of the Only God, Father, Son, and the Holy Spirit, and the Incarnation of the Son of God." Only those two points of faith, namely, the trinity and the incarnation, were dealt with here. Outerman's writing was signed by nineteen Mennonite preachers besides Outerman. The purpose of this was no doubt twofold: first of all to give the impression that Outerman's rejection of Socinianism, which was not particularly strong,[25] was also shared by the other Mennonite leaders, and also to take from the authorities any occasion to trouble the Mennonites again with accusations of Socinian heresies.

Summarizing, we may, I think, conclude that the Mennonite confessions mentioned thus far were meant in the first place to reunite the divided groups.

They are much different in character, for instance, from the Dutch Confession of Faith of the Calvinists (*Confessio Belgica*) which, written by Guido de Bray in 1561, approved by the Synod of Antwerp in 1566, in Middelburg in 1581, and since 1619 by decision of the Synode Nationaal at Dordrecht, has become the official confession of the Reformed Church in the Netherlands.

Both as to structure and contents—the *Confessio Belgica* strives for completeness, and as to purpose and use—already in 1563 the Synod of Armentiers decided that all who serve the Reformed Church must underwrite this confession as the only legal confession—this confession differs in many ways from the Mennonite confessions.

Such authority the Mennonite confessions never had, at least not before the middle of the seventeenth century, and after that only partly. As to contents, the Mennonite confessions did not aim to present an exhaustive Christian teaching of faith, but only occupy themselves with certain dogmatic questions, namely, those which formed the points of difference between the groups they wanted to unite. Besides this, they are extremely poor as far as theological standards are concerned, which is not surprising since their originators hardly ever were trained theologians.[26]

25 W. J. Kühler, *Het Socinianisme in Nederland* (Leiden, 1912) 90-105.

26 Until far into the seventeenth century most of the Mennonite preachers were "lay preachers," recruited from among the brethren of the congregation. S. Hoekstra Bzn, however, goes too far when he writes (*Beginselen en leer der Oude Doopsgezinden*, 255) that the Mennonites after all have only one teaching, namely, that of the human freedom, while the contents of

It is most certainly an interesting and likewise important undertaking to examine the Mennonite confessions on their dogmatic contents. Until now no attention has been given to this.[27] And we cannot give any further thought to this within the limits of this lecture. But by way of illustration I will go into this subject a little deeper on one point.

It is regarding the subject of the Fall of man. The *cardo rerum* in the doctrine of the Fall in these theological discussions again and again is this question: What changed in human nature because of the Fall? Against the Roman Catholic teaching of the *donum superadditum,* which was lost, the Reformed Church put the doctrine of complete change and total depravity. Let us listen one moment to the Dutch Confession, Article 14: by violating God's commandments Adam "was separated from God, having perverted his whole nature, made himself guilty of a physical and spiritual death. And in all his ways godless, wrong, and perverted, he lost all his wonderful talents which God gave him, and nothing remains with him but the lesser parts thereof." If one wants to remark that from the Adam in the *status rectus* something good remains, even though there are only trifling remnants, or as the older editions of the *Confessio Belgica* say, "small sparks," then this optimism will be cut off immediately by the sentence which follows, which states that these small remains are "sufficient to take from man all innocence, consequently all the light within us has changed into darkness." So we may conclude that on this point there is no difference between the Confession and Question 8 of the Heidelberg Catechism and the answer to it, viz., that "we are totally unable to do any good, and inclined to all evil."

What do the Mennonite confessions say about this subject? A number of them do not mention it at all, a proof for our theorem that our confessions were above all for the greater part occasional pieces in which only the points of controversy were dealt with. Only three of the older confessions and that of Ris, which I will discuss later, dealt with this problem. The Dordrecht Confession of 1632 comes closest to the Reformed point of view; we read in Article II, Of the Fall of Man, . . . "that they [i.e., humanity] did, therefore,

the other Christian doctrines, as for instance original sin and atonement of Christ, are more or less "currency out of circulation."

27 J. H. Wessel in his excellent dissertation, *De Leerstellige strijd tussen de Nederlandsche Gereformeerden en Doopsgezinden in de zestiende eeuw* (Assen, 1945), only casually mentions the confession; W. J. Kühler, *Geschiedenis der Nederl. Doopsgezinden in de zestiende eeuw* (Haarlem, 1932) and *Geschiedenis van de Doopsgezinden in Nederland,* II.1 (Haarlem, 1940), treats the contents of the confessions only superficially. In my opinion he has too little appreciation for their dogmatic contents. The older work of S. Hoekstra Bzn, *Beginselen en Leer der Oude Doopsgezinden, vergeleken met die der overige Protestanten* (Amsterdam, 1863), gives much less than one could expect, partly because the author has cut off his way toward exhaustive study by his Ritschlian conception that good-natured piety never could become doctrine without degeneration.

through this one sin, so far apostatize, depart, and estrange themselves from God, that they could neither help themselves, nor be helped by any of their descendants, nor by angels, nor by any other creature in heaven or on earth, nor be redeemed, or reconciled to God; but would have had to be forever lost, had not God, who pitied His creatures, in mercy, interposed in their behalf and made provision for their restoration." This passage, which in comparison with the Reformed view, accentuates more man's incapacity than his absolute corruptness, will later in essence be taken over in the confession of the Old Flemish (1775).[28]

Besides the Dordrecht Confession, Jan Cents's confession of 1630 and Hans de Ries's confession of 1610 also touch this problem. But here the statements are diametrically opposed to the Reformed teachings; Jan Cents says in Article 4, "The Lord gave man after the Fall as well as before the freedom to accept or reject the offer of God's grace through faith in the promised Messiah." Almost identically Ries states in Article 5 that "Man, created perfect and standing in that perfection, had the power to listen to, accept or reject all things which the spirit of evil presented to him. After the Fall and living in sin, he had likewise the power to listen to, accept or reject the occurring good which God Himself presented to him. For as he showed his ability to choose between accepting or refusing evil before the Fall, and accepted it, likewise has he after the Fall the ability to choose between and accept the good. And this power, namely, to accept or reject God's grace, has remained with his offspring by grace."[29] Cornelis Ris in his confession writes copiously about this in Article VIII, how the "pain and misery" of Adam's disobedience fell back upon him and his offspring. Part of the misery was that from that time they stood under the wrath and disfavor of the holy and righteous, supreme Being. But we get out of the detailed yet not very clear formulation of Ris the impression that the "misery" was limited to what he calls their "falling out of their innocence."

In summarizing we may conclude in regard to this point that, with the exception of the Dordrecht Confession and the confession of

28 *Geloofsbelydenisse der Doopsgesinden bekent onder de naam van Oude Vlamingen, hunne Societeits Vergaderinge houdende in de Botteringe-straat te Groningen.* In 1743 the "Dantziger Old Flemish" had also accepted this confession. Both of them referred to the Dordrecht Confession of 1632. The fact that these two conservative groups of the Dutch Mennonites, who were very much attached to old traditions, only late in the eighteenth century acquired a confession, is evidence that an "outstanding confession" was not a part of the heritage of the Dutch Mennonites.

29 In the same spirit also says Galenus Abrahamsz, "Further we understand that the all-wise Creator, among all the abilities He gave man, also gave a *principium*, an *indifferentie*, or voluntary indifference; so that man is a fit subject for righteous reward or punishment; so that he, uncompelled under God's permissive will, has the free choice to choose the good and to reject the wrong, or on the contrary to accept the evil wrongly and foolishly reject the good." (*Korte Grondstellingen,* following the *Verdediging der Christenen, die Doopsgezinde genaamd worden,* Amsterdam, 1699, Thesis XXIV.)

the Old Flemish Mennonites of 1755, based on the former, all Mennonite confessions agree on and confirm that the Adam after the Fall and his posterity were not much different from the Adam before the Fall. This view resembles those which we know from the disputes with the Calvinists. During the religious dispute of 1578 at Emden the Mennonite speaker Pieter von Ceulen did not want to speak about the Adam before the Fall; "We do not have any other explanation than that of Adam's free choice before the Fall, since we cannot find any more in the Scriptures"; to talk about that would be "philosophy."[30] Therefore we cannot conclude whether Adam's free choice after the Fall is different from before, since the circumstances before and after are altogether different. We understand very well why the Calvinists at Emden (and likewise today) were of the opinion that the Mennonites "wanted to grind off some of the awfulness of the Fall"; indeed, that they even wanted to "excuse the original sin."[31] One thing is clear: the Mennonites wanted to maintain the idea of the free choice in the Fall of man; he has kept God's image, and with it the free choice that goes with God's image. Thus the Mennonites saw in the Adam of before the Fall not so much the perfect man in a *status rectus,* but more of a child, a beginner:[32] the man of after the Fall does not stand in absolute contrast to the man before the Fall. The Calvinists emphasize the breaking—the Mennonites emphasize the continuation.

With this view it appears that the Calvinist doctrine of original sin[33] was not held by the Mennonites. And it is clear that the condemning concluding phrase of Article 15 of the Dutch Confession regarding the rejection of the Pelagian heresies was consciously directed against the Mennonites, even though they are here not mentioned by name, as they are in Articles 34 and 36.

Even though it was true that, according to the Mennonite conception, there was no great loss because of the Fall, as opposed to the Calvinist teaching, the question sometimes arose, as was raised by the preacher Jan Klaasz of Grouw, in the year 1702, whether or not anything ever had changed.[34] Herewith he challenged the "strange misconceptions" of his colleague Douwe Feddriks of Harlingen. These

30 *Protocoll des ghesprecks tot Emden* (1579) fol. 35v, 36r.

31 *Ibid.*, fol. 20r.

32 This we find not only among the Mennonites who were under the influence of Collegiantism or Socinianism; also the Zonist Engel Arendsz van Dooregeest taught this. See Jan Klaasz, *De Leer der Doopsgezinden* (Amsterdam, 1702) 31.

33 Menno Simons and Dirk Philips taught original sin without, however, overstressing this conception. (See Wessel, *op. cit.,* 147-48, 163.) None of the confessions uses the word original sin, although the Dordrecht Confession acknowledges the doctrine. Most outstanding is the rejection by Galenus Abrahamsz: we believe "that the innocent children of today are not born under the damnation of total depravity" (*Korte Grondstellingen,* XXV).

34 Jan Klaasz van Grouw, *De Leer der Doopsgezinden verdedigd tegen de vreemde misduidingen van Douwe Feddriks* (Amsterdam, 1702) 11 ff.

misconceptions were (according to Jan Klaasz) that Feddriks had completely forsaken his historic Mennonite convictions and, especially with his emphasis on original sin and human depravity, had followed the footsteps of Calvinistic theology, in which our sharp-witted town-preacher was entirely right. And what alarmed Jan Klaasz and others above all was that Douwe Feddriks did not stand alone in this.

Here then is the place to come back to our story of the origin and the meaning of the Mennonite confessions.

After the confessions had fulfilled their purpose, as we have seen, of healing the schisms and divisions among the Mennonites, these confessions fell into the background for several decades; this is evident now among other things as they were not reprinted for some time.

But time and circumstance change. A latent difference among the Dutch Mennonites existing from the beginning became more clearly accentuated around the middle of the seventeenth century; namely, that contrast between a spiritualistic faith which, due to its individualistic nature, attached only secondary value to the congregation, and a congregational movement which emphasized the confession as the foundation and wellspring of our faith. In the latter group the confessions became the center, the comprehensive summary of the true doctrine of the true church, while with the spiritualists these confessions had only a minor importance and were acceptable only as far as they agreed with their personal faith.

We find this re-emphasis on the congregation and in connection with that the emphasis on the confessions first with the Flemish, where the old leaven of Dirk Philips was still showing aftereffects. A true church has its true teachings, it was said, and "A good household of Christ directs its steps toward the firm laws of its Master."[35] It was then these Flemish, or at least a great number of them who, fighting spiritualism, which they thought to be a deterioration, "a remarkable looseness," came back to the confessions. At their meeting at Leyden in June, 1660, the question was raised whether it was necessary to set up a new confession which would be—in this it would differ from the previous ones—a binding confession. Already from this first point on the agenda stated in the form of a question, we see from which quarter the wind was blowing. The question was whether it was necessary, "by action of the meeting to charge any elders and

35 Compare: "For this should be specially noted, that in every respectable congregation there must be a confession or document of unity which contains the fundamental chapters which the members of that congregation have together derived from the Scriptures." (*Reductie van de soo Genaemde Deductie*, Amsterdam, 1663, 10.)

ministers to formulate a uniform confession out of the existing ones." This confession was to be examined by the congregations and afterwards be accepted as a general uniform confession. At the meeting they indeed made a move in that direction and nominated a committee.[36] But the new confession never came into existence. I do not know what reason there was for this. After the conference this decision was never mentioned again. But the result of this synod of Leyden was that in 1665 all the old confessions with the exception of the one of de Ries and the one of the old Frisians were published together under the title *The General Confessions of the United Flemish, Frisian, and High German Brotherhood of God.* The title already contains a program, for the word "general" does not have the neutral sense of all existing confessions, but, and this is emphasized in the preface, "To the Reader," the sense of the generally accepted —to show any person that "We in these hard times still stand undivided in the teaching of the Gospel as it was understood by our forefathers." Although it was stated in the introduction that it was "in no way our aim to make a stricter tie for the faithful," in later years it became clear that this ideal was not being maintained. *The General Confessions* were often used since then as binding confessions to which one had to conform, the same as with the Calvinists.

But not everyone in the congregations agreed with this conception. Especially Galenus Abrahamsz[37] and his followers rejected this new system as undesirable and harmful to the faith.[38] A fierce fight flamed up between confessionalists and spiritualists and a new schism between Zonists and Lamists was the result.[39]

The conservatives united themselves in the Zonse Societeit, of which the spiritual document of foundation was the "True Bond of Agreement," in itself not a new confession, but a recognition of and a subjection to the *General Confession,* and of which the first article

36 *Verhaal van't gene verhandelt ende besloten is, in de By-Eenkomste tot Leyden* (Amsterdam, 1661) 3, 4, 10 f.

37 Galenus' Spiritualism goes back to Sebastian Franck (Meihuizen, *ibid.*, p. 82). While the Elders (Confessionalists) were of the opinion that the final goal lay in the true congregation, which would have the earmarks of a pure doctrine and lawfully ordained servants, the spiritualists thought that the main thing was the communion of the individual with Christ (Meihuizen, *op. cit.*, 83). Also to be mentioned is the remarkable attempt of J. P. Schabaelje, who in fact undermined the authority of the confessions among the Mennonites through his *Vereenigingh van de Principale Artijkelen des Geloofs eeniger Doops-ghesinde Ghemeynten, diemen noemt Waterlanders, Vlaminghen, en Duytschen, getrocken uyt hare uytgegevene Confessien tot dienst van alle vreed-lievenden* (Amsterdam, 1640) reprinted 1674, 1739.

38 In Galenus' circles there was always the complaint that the confessions were almost as sanctified as the Bible itself; yes, that the confessions were even valued above the Holy Scriptures (Meihuizen, *op. cit.*, 81).

39 Zonists, named after the church building "the Zon" in Amsterdam, to which the opponents of Galenus moved in 1664 shortly after the division; Lamists, after the church building "bij 't Lam" in the same city, where Galenus and his followers continued to worship.
Before the "war of the Lambs" led to the schism in Amsterdam, the anti-confessionalists in Utrecht were forced by the city authorities, under pressure of the Calvinists, to subject themselves to a confession. (See W. J. Kühler, "De strijd om de belijdenis in de vereenigde Vlaamsche, Friesche en Hoogduitsche gemeente to Utrecht," in *Doopsgezinde Bijdragen,* 1916, 145-95.)

says thus: "That we find the general belief found in our well-known Confessions to be according to and agreeing with the Holy Word of God revealed in the Holy Scriptures and accordingly submit ourselves to and accept uprightly and unanimously to teach these in our congregations without contradicting it. The teachers," it says further, "who are to examine our brethren in faith" must study that which is implied here; the newly chosen teachers were required to conform to the *Confessions*.[40]

Not alone among the United Flemish congregations do we find this confessionalism for some time. Elsewhere there were similar movements. In the Frisian Society of North Holland one can observe likewise a temporary upsurge of confessional authority.[41] Even the originally liberal Waterlanders only partly escaped this confessionalist tendency. And especially in some North Holland congregations it caused considerable agitation. Some Waterlander congregations joined the Zonse Societeit and important persons among the Waterlanders, such as the preacher Engel Arendsz van Dooregeest from de Rijp, became leading figures in that Societeit. The congregation at Wormerveer in 1675 fell into great discord about the question whether the preachers had to keep to confessions (in this case the one of de Ries).[42] Shortly before, in July, 1673, twelve Waterlander congregations bound themselves to the promise that they would not employ preachers who did not declare themselves in agreement with the *Confession*.[43] There was some resistance to this. The Mennonite archives at Amsterdam have some twelve notarized declarations to the effect that the confessions of Hans de Ries, which many wanted to recognize as binding authority, never had had this value before and that no teacher or deacon had ever been required to underwrite and accept these.[44]

It is hard to explain what was behind this tendency to attribute so much more authority to those confessions than they previously had. The defenders again and again took a position that the "unlimited tolerance" which gained ground in the Mennonite brotherhood under the influence of the Collegiantism, and also the penetration of Socinian teaching, made the maintaining of a stricter policy necessary, because, they argued, in view of the fact that all kinds of

40 *Het Oprecht Verbond van Eenigheyt* in *Algemeene Belijdenissen* (Amsterdam, 1665) fol. 10.

41 Although it was decided in this society in 1655 to bind themselves exclusively to the Word of God and not to the "old teachings" (read: confessions), later on it was decided to retain the confessions. But in 1746 a plan to have all the preachers of subsidized congregations conform to a confession was rejected. (S. Blaupot ten Cate, *Geschiedenis der Doopsgezinden in Holland*, Amsterdam, 1847, II, 75-77.)

42 *Inventaris der Archiefstukken berustende bij de Ver. Doopsgezinde Gemeente te Amsterdam*, (Amsterdam, 1883) Nos. 900-5.

43 *Inventaris* I, No. 892.

44 *Inventaris* I, No. 708.

strange teachings were preached in our churches there was the danger that the borders between the Mennonite Church, which they still considered the true church of Christ, and the other denominations would fade away.[45] Confessionalism thus can be regarded partly as a reactionary phenomenon, to which can be added as an observation that many of the more conservative Mennonites more or less consciously came under the influence of the Calvinist church. Douwe Feddriks was given the title of "Calvinistic Mennonite" by his opponent Jan Klaasz. Transfer of membership to the Dutch Reformed Church was not uncommon during the second part of the seventeenth century, even though that was not always for the purpose of finding more solidity of teaching.

This attaching of greater authority to the confessions was not only a sign of reaction; it was likewise a revival, a reorientation to the convictions of Menno Simons and Dirk Philips. It is not purely accidental that during this time Menno Simons' works were reprinted twice.[46] In the writings of the conservative leaders such as Engel Arendsz, Jacobus Rijsdijk, and especially Herman Schijn the name of Menno Simons occurs surprisingly often.

Confessionalism was a temporary movement, even though it was vigorously defended from 1650 to 1740. Among the defenders I name, besides the above Douwe Feddriks, also Lambert Bidloo and Herman Schijn.

A few notes about Bidloo: this deacon of the Zon congregation at Amsterdam still kept wholly to the idea that his own congregation was the true congregation of God and that the "Independents," as he called the Galenists, were eager to destroy the congregation: there was salvation only in the strict maintaining of the old confessions.[47]

Much more temperate was the scholar Dr. Herman Schijn, preacher of the Zon congregation in the capital. For our purpose I have in mind especially a booklet which he wrote in 1727, "Plan for the Reunion of the Mennonite Christians." Here he met the Lamists halfway, by declaring all kinds of things which are considered necessities for the congregation in the *General Confessions,* such as footwashing, prohibition of marriages outside the church, and shunning, to be not strictly essential, and more so by awarding a greater value to the de Ries confession than to the *General Confession.* He

45 Especially this Collegiantism, with its free speaking, was considered to be a danger.

46 The first collection of the originally separately printed books of Menno Simons was printed in 1600-1 (*Sommarie Ofte By een vergaderinge van sommige schriftelijcke Bekentenissen des Gheloofs*). In 1646 a second collection appeared, *Opera, ofte Groot Sommarie.* In 1681 in Amsterdam the final collection appeared, *Opera Omnia Theologica, of alle de godtgeleerde wercken.*

47 Lambert Bidloo, *Mennoos kerck in en uyt Babel* (Amsterdam, 1665); *Onbepaalde Verdraagzaamheyd de verwoesting der Doopsgezinden,* Amsterdam, 1701).

wanted to promote the unity of the divided Mennonites and for that reason to "avoid a too narrow and strict precision on such matters, about which we can be just as well more lenient . . . which by no means are a part of the fundamentals of salvation."[48] He did not want to place the confessions beside and most certainly not above the Word of God, but—and here he is after all a typical confessionalist—"a loose indecisiveness" and an "indifference regarding the teachings" were foundations for the decline of the Mennonites. Where the leading principles necessary for salvation are expressed in confessions they have to be enforced.[49]

In spite of Schijn's temperate but powerful defense, the appreciation for the confessions decreased. In 1722, when the State of Friesland under pressure of the Calvinists demanded that the Mennonites bind themselves to one specific formula, the 150 preachers in Friesland, with the exception of one, refused to meet this obligation, because, among other reasons, "the Mennonites are not used to signing any binding formulae, and leave it to the individual to bind himself and his conscience to the Scriptures."[50] Also among the conservatives there was not much interest any more. The publication of the last Mennonite confession, the one of Cornelis Ris in 1766, was nothing less than a tragedy.[51] In the church council of the very conservative congregation of Hoorn, where Ris was one of the preachers, the question was raised whether a new confession which was to be a binding one would be a desirable thing, and so they decided to make up such a confession for the congregation. Furthermore, the question came up whether it would be necessary to introduce such a confession to the whole Zonse Societeit, to replace the old confessions which were not strictly maintained. The Hoorn representative proposed this for the first time at the Societeit meeting of May 4, 1759. The proposal, though listened to with considerable emotion, found nevertheless a lukewarm reception; and in the years to come the Hoorn representatives had to repeat their proposal again and again till in 1761 the conference recommended that they present a rough draft. The tentative draft was read in the meeting of 1762 by the representative of Hoorn, but it found a lot of opposition, so that the whole thing had to be reworked. In 1766 the revised draft, of which Cornelis Ris was the originator, was printed and sent

48 H. Schijn, *Ontwerp*, p. 93.

49 *Ibid.*, 107-9.

50 S. Blaupot ten Cate, *Geschiedenis der Doopsgezinden in Friesland* (Leeuwarden, 1839) 206-8; the form used in that city.

51 Cornelis Ris, *Kort Berigt van 't voorgevallene over de Geloofsleere* (Hoorn, 1776). See also N. van der Zijpp, *Geschiedenis der Doopsgezinden in Nederland* (Arnhem, 1952) 167-69, 179.

to all the members of the Societeit for criticism. In the following years, in spite of constant pressure by Hoorn, no attention was paid to this matter, and the discussion about it at the meeting was postponed every time, until Hoorn in 1776, ten years after the presentation of the first draft, saw its confession accepted. This confession was accepted without any discussion. So now the confession was approved, in fact the only Mennonite confession ever brought about through official church sanction. But the confession of Ris never had any authority. Already a few years later the Hoorn church council complained that the confession "is not respected." Only three congregations seem to have introduced it, namely, Hoorn itself, Westzaan-Zuid, and Almelo. The cause of this cannot be sought in the unimportance and lengthy copiousness of this typical eighteenth-century writing, which had the significant title of "The Teachings of Faith of the True Mennonites or Anabaptists," but more in the fact that there was no longer any need for a confession, and certainly not for a binding confession, not even in the circles of the formerly confessionalistic Zonists. Ris's confession came too late. The time of "outstanding confessions" was past, at least for the Dutch Mennonites.[52] Here the conviction of Galenus Abrahamsz, "that the living piety was the only and the all" and that confessions "always stayed below the inexpressible secrets, which they want to bring in words,"[53] had triumphed: neither at the union of the Zon and the Lam congregations at Amsterdam in 1801 nor at the founding of the Algemeene Doopsgezinde Societeit in 1811, where for the first time in centuries the unity of the Dutch Mennonites became a reality, was the point of confessions brought up.

And if one wants to raise the objection that this concerns a concentration of liberalists, then my thesis, that the Dutch Mennonites always rejected the desirability of a confession, may find its proof in the fact that even the so-called orthodox Mennonites, as for instance Samuel Muller, Assuerus Doyer, and others, in the beginning of the nineteenth century did not mourn the loss; yes, that even those Mennonites like Pieter van der Goot, who participated wholeheartedly in the revival movement, in which movement the issue of confessions was fought over so intensely, (one thinks here of DeCosta) always testified that they personally did not feel the need for written confessions. And Jan de Liefde, a former Mennonite

52 Ris's confession, published in 1776 in a German translation, was readily accepted by the Mennonite congregation of Hamburg-Altona and a number of communities of West Prussia, and still later by many congregations in Russia and America where it is still in use today among the General Conference Mennonites. Several other groups of American Mennonites, including the largest of all, the so-called Old Mennonites, still use the Dordrecht Confession of 1632, which came to the States via the Palatinate where it was accepted in 1660.

53 Meihuizen, *op. cit.*, 56.

preacher who had left the Mennonite Church because of its liberalism, later on, when he conducted a home mission in charge of a confessional organization, often brought his commissioners to despair by his aversion toward the confessional church and his founding of the Free Evangelical Church.[54]

As far as I know, since then no other step has been taken among the Mennonites of Holland to design a confession: in the Vereniging voor Gemeentedagen, founded in 1917, which originally was the more conservative section of our brotherhood, if I recall rightly, once, when a new statement of principles was being discussed, the wish was uttered from a certain side in favor of a new confession; but in that meeting the wise and pious C. Nijdam felt compelled to oppose the plan with the conviction that a confession more often is a sign of weakness than of strength, and quite often divides rather than unites. The item itself was dismissed then.

These days a new type of confession will appear out of the circle of a number of our younger preachers. They desire to come to more of an outline of the faith, partly to bring to a stop the "remarkable looseness" of the Mennonites, partly to be able to say to the non-Mennonite, "See, this is what we Mennonites believe. . . ." One does not have to answer this attempt, which is in the spirit of our time, with an admonishing "Caveant consules," for an awareness of the principles of the faith is more than ever needed. But on the other hand one may expect the proponents of confessions to make a careful study of our history.

I for myself would gladly keep to the word of the martyr Claesken, who, when the inquisitor spoke about the authority of the confession of the church, simply said, "We do not need any other writings but the Holy Scriptures."[55]

54 F. J. de Holl, "Jan de Liefde, zijn denkbeeldn over de gemeente en zijne vroomheid," in *Doopsgezinde Bijdragen,* 1901, 164-75, 180-94; S. Coolsma, *J. de Liefde in zijn leven en werken geschetst* (Nijkerk, 1917) 207 *et passim.*

55 *Het Offer des Heeren,* 327.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE MENNONITE "HOF" OF THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY PALATINATE INTO THE MENNONITE CHURCHES OF PFALZ-RHEINLAND TODAY

GERHARD HEIN*

It is apparent that Mennonitism in Germany in the course of the four hundred years of its development has shown many local differences. The urban congregations of Northwest Germany, of Dutch origin, for example, are of a very different type than the rural congregations of South Germany, of Swiss origin. Likewise, the rural and urban congregations of East and West Prussia have had their own development as compared with those of South or West Germany. The Mennonite congregations scattered throughout South Germany have again in their own area shown wide deviation in the course of their development.

Here our attention is to be focused upon one group of South German Mennonites; namely, those (numbering 3,000 souls) living in the Palatinate and Hesse on the west of the Upper Rhine. The topic is limited not only with respect to place, but also with respect to time. For the history of the Anabaptist-Mennonites in the Palatinate goes back further than the seventeenth century; there have been numerous Anabaptists and Anabaptist congregations here ever since the Reformation, which were not completely wiped out even by the Thirty Years' War. This early period of Anabaptism in the Palatinate, concerning which we have information in the book by Christian Hege[1] and the recent source book by Manfred Krebs,[2] may be passed by here.

In this survey we will therefore limit ourselves, as to the place, to the present area of Rheinpfalz and Rheinhessen, and as to time, beginning with the immigration of the refugees expelled from Switzerland about 1700, and direct our attention to the independent development of this group of congregations.

The first Mennonite congregations in the Palatinate after the Thirty Years' War were small family and "Hof" (farm)[3] groups. The time of the "flexible congregations, which could assemble only in secret, to comfort one another for battles won and strengthen one

* Gerhard Hein is pastor of the Mennonite Church at Sembach, Palatinate, Germany.

1 Chr. Hege, *Die Täufer in der Kurpfalz* (Frankfurt a. M., 1908).

2 M. Krebs, *Quellen zur Geschichte der Täufer (IV)*, Baden and Pfalz (Gütersloh, 1951).

3 "Hof" means a larger farmstead. The members of such a congregation met on one of the larger "Hofs," on which the manor house usually had a room large enough for the assembly. The congregation was then named after the "Hof" which was the most common place of meeting. It changed its name when the meeting was moved to another "Hof." Sometimes the "Hof" or estate was divided into a number of smaller farms and thus became in effect a small village, e.g., Weyerhof, Ibersheimerhof, Deutschof, Branchweilerhof, Spitalhof.

another for coming persecution," as Johann Risser says concerning the Anabaptist congregations of the sixteenth century, was past. Now the Mennonites of the Palatinate possessed government concessions, which expressly permitted them to hold religious meetings, even though in limited numbers. From the beginning each group also had its own preachers and deacons. The statistics given by Jakob Everling of Obersülzen on January 4, 1672, name twelve preachers *(Diener am Worte)* and six deacons *(Diener der Armen)* among the 643 immigrant Mennonites.[4]

In spite of manifold limitations by church and state, the small family and "Hof" congregations in the first fifty years developed everywhere into larger local congregations, which met in large rooms or barns, with more or less freedom. A list of 1732 names the following congregations with their preachers and deacons and the villages (or Hofs) belonging to them: Mannheim 35 families, Eppstein 40 families, Annweilertal 20 families, Spitalhof 25 families, Friedelsheim 40 families, Gerolsheim 40 families, Kriegsheim 27 families, Oberfloersheim 13 families, Wolfsheim 18 families, Weierhof 20 families, Ibersheimerhof 36 families, Fischbach 35 families, Sembach 20 families, Zweibrücken 27 families, a total of 458 families in 14 congregations. (East of the Rhine there were 13 congregations with 160 families.) Each of these congregations had two to four preachers and one or two deacons. The congregations formed closed entities and the families were closely attached to one another.

The Palatine congregations at that time still cultivated active intercourse with their Swiss mother congregation. In 1762 several preachers from Switzerland traveled through the congregations of the Palatinate, and upon their return home brought grateful report of their work. The occasion for this as well as later journeys of the Swiss leaders was a schism between the group in the Upper Palatinate and that in the Lower Palatinate, the former group being those living east of the Rhine, and the latter those west of the Rhine. This tension in the second half of the eighteenth century indicates the independent development of the congregations west of the Rhine at that early date. More or less independent single congregations developed here, in contrast to those east of the Rhine, in which the single elder continued to be the final authority for the entire area. At that time the elder was Abraham Zeisset, who caused his fellow elders and the Palatinate Mennonites no little distress. The struggle cast their shadow as far as Switzerland and West Prussia. In 1782 peace is reported to have been restored at the Himmelshaeuserhof.

4 E. Müller, *Geschichte der Bernischen Täufer* (Frauenfeld, 1895).

Meanwhile independent congregations throughout the Palatinate took on more definite form. Here and there, with the aid of their Dutch brethren, the first little churches were built, such as Ibersheim, Friedelsheim, Eppstein, Kriegsheim, and Weierhof.

On January 1, 1787, a new church was dedicated by Jacob Galli, the preacher at Erbesbüdesheim. The elder of this congregation was Johannes Krehbiel of Wartenberg, who made a trip to Crefeld and wrote a letter to the Dutch congregations for the specific purpose of raising money for a new church. The permission of the Imperial Duke of Wartenberg to build the church, and the financial account, are still extant in the original. The Neuwied congregation, which maintained close connections with the Palatinate, acquired its church as early as 1768, not only with the permission, but "upon the demand of our gracious ruler" *(Landesvater),* as Lorenz Friedenreich of Neuwied wrote in a letter to the Danzig congregation.

Concerning the external growth and the inner structure of the Palatinate Mennonite congregations of that time there are some very informative letters written by the Palatinate elders 1760-80 to Elder Hans van Steen in Danzig. The elder of the Gerolsheim congregation, Jacob Hirschler, a weaver by trade, who owned some land and "distilled a little brandy" on the side, enumerated all the congregations of the Palatinate with their elders and their membership in a letter dated April 20, 1769: "In Goennheim lives Elder Abraham Oellenberger; his congregation at Erpolzheim and Friedelsheim numbers 140 brethren and sisters. The congregation at the Spitalhof numbers 45 members, the congregation at Ruchheim 26 members. In Gundersblum lives Elder Daniel Stauffer; he cares for the congregation at Alsheim and Ibersheimerhof, consisting of 120 members. In Oberfloersheim lives Elder Christian Weber; the congregation there and in Spiesheim consists of 100 members. The congregation at Griesheim has 52 members. In Wartenberg lives Elder Johannes Krehbiel; his congregation consists of 250 members. Eight hours from us lives Elder Jakob Galey, whom we, I and Johannes Krehbiel, ordained as Elder at the Weyerhof, consisting of 90 members. The congregation at Rheingrafenstein numbers 32 members. At Geisberg lives Elder Daniel Hirschler; his congregation at Roedern and Schafbusch consists of 45 members. He also serves the congregation at Boechingen, consisting of 68 members. Twenty hours from here lives Johannes Schnebely; his congregation at Zweibrücken consists of 94 members. The congregation at Gerolsheim, Obersülzen, and Heppenheim, which I serve, consists of 112 members. The congregation at Hoeningen consists of 54 members. The congregation at Epp-

stein, Friesenheim, Mannheim will be described by our dear brother, Elder Martin Moellinger."[5]

In this enumeration, in sharp contrast to that of 100 years earlier, each congregation, and in some cases several congregations, had only one elder, who probably was as a rule also the only preacher. To be sure, the congregations were not yet by any means "pastor churches," as some of them became 50 or 100 years later, but by this time they had become "elder churches," which would soon be lacking in voluntary preachers. Lorenz Friedenreich in a letter of February 27, 1775, indicated that this shortage existed in the congregations of Mannheim and Rheingrafenstein. No one was willing to accept the office of preacher. "This error, which may well be called disobedience, is unfortunately making serious inroads in the Palatinate. For since at times one or another is spared because of the weakness of his capacities or other real reasons, others base their refusal on these cases, and so the friends in the Palatinate have much to do."[6]

However clearly evident the first signs of a shortage of preachers and elders are here, it is equally pleasant to ascertain from the documents of the time that the elders and no doubt also their congregations were rooted in a rich Anabaptist tradition and probably also developed a genuine life of faith. "Our services," writes Elder Jakob Hirschler, "we are permitted to hold openly, wherever we like, and also observe communion and baptism and perform marriages. We may also bury our dead openly, and funeral sermons are delivered often to a large audience, as in the case of other religions. We are unlearned people and teach our congregations simply, but with thanksgiving that God has revealed what is necessary to the simple. We also prove with the Word that one may be baptized upon his faith, which baptism does not signify the removal of the dirt of the flesh, but is rather the bond of a good conscience with God. Then when our youth have been brought thereby to conviction, they come to one of our ministers or deacons and make their request. Then they come to the ministers and deacons at a stated time to express the foundation of their faith, and they are taught the articles of our faith. This takes place once or twice. During this time this is announced to the congregation and the applicants' names are presented. Then if they are found well established through the help of an all-gracious God, the congregation is asked whether they can accept them as brethren and sisters. Even if no objection is raised, they are informed that on the following Sunday they will make a statement of their faith before the public congregation. On the next Sunday they

5 Church Book of the Sembach (Pal.) Congregation, Vol. I, 263.
6 *Op. cit.*, 265.

are then, again before the congregation, received, kneeling and with earnest prayer in the name of the Triune God. But for this step we do not designate a time, but such persons are thus served at different times, nor do we make a law of age, but rather their confession is considered. I have served thus in their sixteenth, seventeenth, or eighteenth year. After baptism they are offered the hand, the kiss of peace, and they are made a part of the congregation. Communion is observed twice—at Easter and at Michaelmas. Those who use foot-washing in connection with communion are not objected to, but we recognize them as our true brethren. Also we practice church discipline; those who lead an offensive life are put in the ban and excluded from the congregation; this is also the procedure with those who marry into another religion. In addition, an effort is made not to be entirely conformed to the world in matters of dress; but it is a matter of great regret that pride and show are daily gaining the upper hand."[7]

This is, on the whole, a favorable picture, which reveals Mennonite congregations that are still closed and bound by tradition, which in spite of emigration of their best forces across the sea at every period, still preserved for a long time their Mennonite character. From the ranks of the next generation of elders and preachers about 1800, tower a series of personalities, whom the Palatine congregations produced from their own ranks. One of them is Valentin Dahlem of Mosbach near Wiesbaden, whom Christian Hege characterized as one "of the most important South German Mennonite preachers" of the turn of the century. In the Weierhof congregation it was the well-known Adam Krehbiel (1766-1804), who was the personal friend of and carried on a correspondence with Gerhard Tersteegen, whom Tersteegen called "a man after God's own heart." In Sembach it was the elders Heinrich Würtz of Wartenberg and Johannes Eymann of Lohmühle, whom Johannes Risser later called "two pillars of the church, each in his own way serving the church, both living together in sincere unity."[8] When one of them died, the other testified, "The crown has fallen from our heads."

This was the generation of elders that assembled at Ibersheim in 1803 and 1805, who sought to prevent the inner deterioration of the congregations, which was conspicuously evident here and there during the French occupation (1796-1816). Precisely these Ibersheimer resolutions reveal the great need for such preventive action. Furthermore they show many a lack and poverty of the elders and preachers of the time. The elders and preachers were also to be helped by the

7 *Op. cit.*, 263 f. 8 *Op. cit.*, 284.

publication of a common formulary. In addition, directives for the practice of church discipline were set up. The age of baptismal candidates was set at thirteen or fourteen. Repetition of baptism in the case of transfer from another creed was rejected. Bearing arms and armed service were forbidden on the old principle of nonresistance. This question caused the leaders particular trouble in the upsurge of patriotism during the French occupation. On account of the general oppression and tribulation resulting from the quartering of soldiers on the populace, June 28, 1805, was set aside as a general day of repentance, fasting, and prayer in all the congregations on this side of the Rhine and on the Neckar, "in order that the general evil may be averted." This evil, we know today, was by no means averted. Dr. W. Mannhardt therefore designated the resolutions of Ibersheim as "the sunset glow in the sky of old-fashioned Mennonitism in the Rhineland."[9]

It is a fact that after the French occupation in the Palatine congregations, which during this time were also almost completely isolated from their sister congregations, lamentably little of the spirit of the old Anabaptism remained. Pastor Johannes Risser gives the following gloomy description of this period: "The time when the Palatinate was a part of France (1796-1816) was probably a good one in respect to the economic rise of many families. People adapted themselves to the French life, adopted French polish, and made use of the time to work themselves up to prosperity. How could they help but feel good, when the old restrictions had fallen and the conditions of the time were so favorable? To be sure, this took place at the expense of the old tried and tested simplicity, honest discipline, and congregational order. Precisely the stern resolutions of Ibersheim of June 5, 1803, which deal not only with prohibitions and penalties concerning dancing, comedies (farces), card-playing, billiards, dice, pride, swearing, oaths, bearing arms, jewelry of women, serving as godfathers in other denominations, but even with drunkenness, fornication, and adultery among the ministers, show to what extent they had deviated from the earlier simple customs and stern morality. The large conference, including very competent, capable men of the old stamp, once more sought to restore the old simple Mennonitism. But these stipulations were not likely to have been applied in their full severity in any congregation, least of all in the Ibersheim congregation. French world-conformity with progressing wealth exercised its influence."[10]

9 W. Mannhardt, *Die Wehrfreiheit der Altpreusseschen Mennoniten* (Marienburg, 1863) 55.
10 Sembach Church Book, I, 267.

Here we stand before an essential point in the question of how the Mennonite Hofs of the seventeenth century became the Mennonite congregations of the Palatinate. The Mennonite congregations of the Palatinate, it must be admitted, were to a large degree in the grasp of a fateful dissolution about 1820. Nevertheless the congregations had no intention of giving themselves up or to unite with the state church. Such an intention has actually been charged against the Mennonites of the Palatinate. Pastor Risser continues, "Furthermore in 1818 when the Lutheran and Reformed churches of the Palatinate merged, rather on a basis of indifferentism than of Biblicism, an attempt was made by their clergy to draw the Mennonites also into this union; but it was found that in the congregations of the Palatinate there was more of a sound core and an inborn love for their original free, independent position than had been supposed. These attempts failed completely."[11]

How then does one explain the further existence and in part strengthening of Mennonitism in the Palatinate and Hesse in the first half of the nineteenth century? The only possible answer is: Through the installation of professional Mennonite ministers, some of whom were the product of the Palatine Mennonite congregations, and others of whom were called in from the outside. In Monsheim there was Leonard Weydmann of Holland, who gathered anew and established the congregation in 1819-36. He was followed by the extraordinarily capable and zealous Johannes Molenaar of Crefeld in 1836-68. In Sembach the work of gathering and strengthening the congregation was done by Johannes Risser of Friedelsheim in 1832-68, who had studied theology at the University of Erlangen and came to Sembach as a young, enthusiastic preacher. Weierhof called Hermann Reeder of Neuwied, who was not of Mennonite extraction, and who had received his training at a Baptist seminary in England. Friedelsheim found a minister from its own midst, the teacher Jakob Ellenberger, Sr., after other preachers had emigrated to America. Several congregations, such as Altleiningen and Kühboerncheshof, held to a lay ministry a while longer, as did also the Amish congregations. This is still true in the congregations of the South Palatinate, Spitalhof and Deutschhof, also in all of Baden and Württemberg.

Doubtless the engagement of vocational pastors meant the sacrifice of an Anabaptist principle, and this loss has in many respects tended to conform the Mennonite congregations of the Palatinate and Hesse with the surrounding established church, especially since the Mennonite preachers to a large extent obtained their education

11 *Ibid.*

at Protestant universities or seminaries. Nevertheless it must be said that this step had within it an inward compulsion and has in many respects resulted in blessing. The congregations were gathered and strengthened anew. Externally viewed this was revealed in a new era of church building. Churches still standing were built now: Monsheim 1820, Weierhof 1837, Friedelsheim 1838, etc. In Sembach under Pastor Risser the little church built in 1777 was completely torn down and rebuilt in much larger form in 1853. The church book describes in glowing colors the rededication of the church, which was attended by the entire congregation and by many guests from far and near, and concludes the account with the following words: "Church life and interest took a new upswing, and attendance at regular Sunday services in the new church was large."[12]

Hand in hand with the erection of churches and parsonages there was many an innovation in church life and service. A new formulary (1852), a new hymnal (1854), and a new catechism (1841 and 1854) were composed and introduced. As a leader in this work stood Johannes Molenaar in Monsheim together with Johannes Risser in Sembach and Jakob Ellenberger in Friedelsheim. The innovations were accompanied with much resistance on the part of conservative Mennonites, but with the authority of the new leaders they were nevertheless carried out. These leading personalities indeed stood on a high spiritual and intellectual plane, as their works eloquently testify. Of interest is the opinion of W. H. Riehl, the culture historian, concerning these men: "Among the educated ministers of the Mennonites there are furthermore men before whose scholarly and humanistic education the light of many a Catholic and Protestant pastor may be as dark as a street light in Westrich."[13]

In spite of many tensions and much friction which the employed pastors had to endure in their congregations, these pastors on the whole considered this new solution fortunate and right. The last lay ministers to be chosen, who had performed their tasks in many cases with sighs, were happy to take their place in the pew in front of the pulpit of the recently called preacher. The church boards felt relieved of a burden; for the most part they now had only to care for the support of the preacher and the church buildings. (This did not always take place satisfactorily.) The congregations were glad to be edified by good sermons. The voice of the congregation may be found in the description of a baptismal celebration in Monsheim written by Jakob Krehbiel of the Randeckerhof, a later chairman of the Sembach church board:

12 *Op. cit.*, 28. 13 W. H. Riehl, *Die Pfälzer* (1858) 375.

"Today (Oct. 3, 1856) I saw and experienced religious life at its height in the baptismal celebrations in the Mennonite church in Monsheim. I have heard many sermons by believing clergymen in Mennonite as well as in Protestant churches; I have attended confirmation and other solemn occasions; I have felt and grasped the sincerity of the Christian life of faith in missionary meetings; but such a height of life as I experienced today through Pastor Molenaar in Monsheim has never yet been my privilege. Never have I been so overcome by the earnestness and the solemnity and the sacredness of Christianity or of the Christian cult as here. Where there was still a spark of Christian faith it could not help but be reawakened and fanned into a flame. This earnestness and this dignity of admonition, this all-permeating sincerity of prayer, this solemnity of the ordinance was bound to put before the soul the full force of the holiness of the bond made with Christ. . . . O that all preachers of the divine Word might be permeated by all the power and the earnestness of the Christian life and being as Molenaar was!"[14]

Today this very congregation of Monsheim is orphaned. There is cause for serious reflection in the fact that the congregations of the Palatinate and Hesse, with a few notable exceptions, have produced no preachers from their own midst for about 120 years; the ministers have always come from the outside. Besides, these ministers have frequently stood very much alone in their vocation. To be sure, congregations cannot exist without preachers. Faithful, conscientious preachers and ministers contribute substantially to the standing of a congregation. The Palatine congregations of the last 150 years owe much to the work of their ministers, to a Christian Neff, for instance, at the Weierhof, and his co-workers in other congregations. Still, after this backward look we must stress the point that more is needed for a fruitful church life in the spirit of Anabaptist-Mennonitism. For this, above all, are needed active church boards and live church members, who see in their congregation both what it is and what it ought to be; namely, the place where the blessing of God is inwardly imparted to it, but where it also is given the task of witnessing to its faith within and without, by word and deed. The future of the Mennonite churches of the Palatinate and Hesse will to a large extent depend upon the manner in which our youth grows into the old congregations, the degree to which our refugee brethren from West Prussia revitalize our churches, and the new spiritual and intellectual exchange with our neighboring and foreign brethren becomes fruitful.

14 Diary of Jakob Krehbiel, Second Series, I, 79.

THE MENNONITE APPROACH TO WORSHIP, AND CURRENT TRENDS

ELMER M EDIGER*

In our day American Mennonites are increasingly challenged by their own standard of living and cultural appreciation to change their pattern of worship. It is quite natural that as homes are beautified there will be increasing thought toward a greater application of art to their houses of worship and to the services of worship. To express themselves in praise and adoration there is the understandable desire to use more means of musical and other forms of expression. To make their worship services psychologically more effective there is a clear readiness to consider a planned and tested order of worship in which the congregation can move together in awe and adoration, praise and thanksgiving, confession and renewal of commitment.

Although there have long been temptations to decorate the wall behind the pulpit with some amateurish painting the whole emphasis on religious art and symbolism has gained increased appreciation among many Mennonites together with their sincere love of Bach. Quite naturally there has followed a fondness for the most beautiful rose and trinity windows and the Gothic or Georgian form of architecture. With this has also come an understanding of the medieval symbols and their message over the centuries.

Thus without any malicious intent many Mennonite individuals and some congregations have suddenly become awakened to the fact that in a piecemeal manner they may gradually have become a part of another system of worship. Many individual aspects may seem helpful, but are we actually adopting a new system that will be helpful to our cause? Or is it possible that we can make conscious helpful changes which only happen to duplicate certain aspects of another system?

This writer is not endeavoring simply to defend the status quo on a historical basis. There is need for more historical research. It would seem apparent however that there needs to be a conscious facing of the current challenge which confronts the Mennonite approach to worship. From some elementary explorations it would

* Elmer Ediger was graduated from Bethel College in 1940 and received his B.D. degree from Mennonite Biblical Seminary in 1952. He was active in the leadership of Mennonite Civilian Public Service, serving as Educational Secretary and later as General Director. After World War II he served as Director of Voluntary Service under the Mennonite Central Committee. He is now General Secretary of the Board of Christian Service, General Conference Mennonite Church, Newton, Kansas.

seem to the writer that neither the early Anabaptists nor contemporary Mennonites have had a consciously defined approach to worship. Certainly there have been some clear emphases, positively on preaching and negatively on idolatry. If Mennonites have a unique approach in keeping with their valid beliefs, it certainly will need to be defined more clearly. Such a defining should be from a dynamic rather than simply a historical point of view. This will be necessary if it will be able to develop side by side and even challenge the liturgical which is literally a well-defined historical science as well as an art.

This paper happens to center on one issue out of many, that is, the appeal of the altar-centered chancel with the side pulpit and lectern. To many Mennonites in our day this may not yet be a real issue. Yet it can serve as the basis for examining not only the liturgical but also the Mennonite approach to worship. Almost any Mennonite congregation does face some question regarding the place and emphasis to be given to beauty and symbolism, color, and other forms in their building and their pattern of worship. Shall it be Gothic? Shall there be a spire? Can there be no cross? What about windows with color, pictures, or symbols? Does the communion table remain in place as a symbol for those Sundays when it is not needed functionally? Is the pulpit a "holy" area? Should such words as "sanctuary," "chancel" have a place in Mennonite terminology?

Framework of Values Needed

When congregations face such questions, how shall they decide? In general our decisions are made in terms of what we think most important. What framework of values can help us to make the best decision in regard to pulpit and chancel arrangement? Many values can be considered, but the question is, Which are to be most central in such decision-making?

1. "What looks right" is one value we are tempted to suggest. On second thought, however, we recognize that what looks right depends upon what we have personally become accustomed to. What looks or feels right at a given time to us personally may be without the benefit of broader and longer range considerations.

2. "Tradition" or the "historical" is another framework by which to make decisions. As our fathers did, so should we. However, we are not satisfied with tradition as our unquestioned guide for such decision-making. Nevertheless, it is wise to think carefully before discarding inherited attitudes, customs, beliefs, and forms, for they may represent valuable corporate Christian experience.

3. "What is the present-day trend?" or "What are others doing?" is another set of values by which we make judgments. It is appealing because, naturally speaking, we want to anticipate and be ahead rather than be behind the times. But, on further thought we recognize that trends depend upon what the average or the cross section is willing to do, and this we all agree may certainly be very unreliable.

4. "What does the best in art and aesthetics teach us?" We should know what the aesthetic representatives of music and architecture have to suggest, but aesthetic specialists may have their own frame of reference, their own goals of "unity" which may not sufficiently include functional and spiritual values which stem from the Bible and Christian experience. Theoretically, aesthetic concerns need not conflict with the best aims of Christianity but, speaking as Christians, none of us wants to make good art or aesthetic criteria the basis for our decision-making. We must also remind ourselves that there is a difference between the feelings of aesthetic appreciation and the worship of God. The question is not the alternative of choosing all or no beauty, all or no symbols; it is rather a question of degree and how centrally we should rely upon physical aids.

5. "What contributes most effectively to our worship?" This is a more basic question which must be considered in terms of the nature and purpose of Christian worship.

The Greeks worshiped beauty and culture when they admired the beautiful Parthenon. In a sense modern man worships material things when he admires the new car his heart prizes most highly. Worship stirs and lifts us toward something of worth. But it should be clear that appreciation of the beautiful and the resulting inward stirrings are not necessarily Christian worship.

Christian worship is leading men to wait to confront, and respond to the objectively existing God as revealed in Jesus Christ. In Christian worship man should be led to receive what God wants to give in renewed strength, vision, judgment, grace, reassurance, and love. But Christian worship has not fulfilled its purpose until man gives himself in true devotion to God for what God in Christ expects of him. Thus the measure of the effectiveness of any Christian approach to worship must not simply be what stirs us, but whether we meet God in Christ and whether we in spirit and in truth promise to obey Him. Paul, in Romans 12 (RSV), implies that reasonable service as a "living sacrifice" is ultimately our true "spiritual worship." Christian worship then is waiting before God for what He wants to give us and giving ourselves to Him for what He expects of us in obedience. It is this latter aspect which is often not

used sufficiently as a criterion for measuring the effectiveness of a given approach to worship.

Worship in a church service is not just an individual concern. As the church considers the effectiveness of its worship approach, it must ask where this approach is taking us as a brotherhood. Like railroad tracks, any given approach tends over a period of time to take its group in a given direction. Effective Christian worship then must grow out of valid central beliefs concerning revelation, the Gospel, the concepts of the church, its mission and the importance of the Christian life.

In the Roman Catholic Church the celebration of the miracle which takes place in each mass is most central. Their church is built not around expression of feeling but around that which happens at the altar as the real sacrifice of Christ is repeated.[1] In the Greek Orthodox Church the whole worship service is developed by their central aim to depict the Divine Mysterious Drama of Creation and Redemption. The worship "is bathed in an atmosphere of emotional expectancy."[2] A third historic type of worship is that of the Oracle, the approach of the Reformed branches of the church which center on that which is uttered. Emphasis is on God's Word, the bowing of the soul before God's revelation, and the volitional response of the human will to obey the divine will.[3] The Quakers, as Hislop, the Scottish Church authority, points out, developed a method of worship distinctly their own. Their method of worship through silence is based on the idea of the Spirit's presence in the minds and consciences of the worshipers, the Inner Light. Theirs is the emphasis on the immanence of God the Spirit, in contrast to the Oracle and Sacrifice types which emphasize the transcendent God.[4] These four approaches toward worship illustrate how an approach to worship grows out of a group's central beliefs if it is to achieve its purpose.

Keeping an approach to worship in line with a given set of beliefs does not rule out aesthetics. New Testament truth and beauty do not clash. It must be recognized, however, that there are different systems of Christian truth ranging, in the nature of authority and ethical emphasis, from the Roman Catholic to the Quaker.

1 D. H. Hislop, *Our Heritage of Public Worship* (Edinburg, 1935) 9. Hislop, a representative from the Church of Scotland admittedly liturgical in his conclusions, has a most helpful and generally sympathetic analysis of these various historical types of public worship. The author recognizes the Quaker approach as having the highest spiritual blending of all the historical types but holds that most groups and individuals are not capable of so high an approach. (216) The author sees no distinct Anabaptist contribution to worship but sees the group as the father of individual liberty, individual interpretation, and the assertion of individual experience, and as having made a prophetic contribution. (213)

2 *Ibid.*, 10.

3 *Ibid.*, 11.

4 *Ibid.*, 216 ff.

Where "the church" is most closely identified with the system this would obviously result in a corresponding aesthetic expression such as the medieval cathedrals. Quakers with emphasis on the Inner Light and ethics have in their system of Christian truth a corresponding aesthetic expression which is more of a functional beauty, generally respected even by high church people. Would Episcopalian aesthetic expression not do an injustice to the central beliefs and system of the Quakers? In such a case the railroad tracks would take them off on a tangent.

Can Mennonites develop their approach to worship effectively by taking over other systems without thought or careful reference to their own central beliefs? Or should Mennonites give more time to creative planning beginning with their central Christian values? This should not rule out aesthetics. Medieval Thomistic truth expressed itself well in Gothic art and architecture. Does Anabaptist interpretation of Biblical truth express itself in the same way? Or is there perhaps a distinctively appropriate beauty of its own in a simple functionalism of art and architecture which keeps clear strongly needed New Testament values? Although we have little statues of Bach in our home, we feel it legitimate to rule out statues of Christ in the church to keep certain spiritual values clear. Likewise, is it not possible that certain other forms of art and symbolism may need to be limited in our church worship in order to keep certain other New Tetsament values more clear?

A very basic question in the discussion which follows is to what degree Mennonites should rely upon beautiful and symbolic physical media to stir us inwardly, to lead us upward as it were on a ladder, in our worship of God. Also do we agree that there are certain validly central Christian emphases in our Mennonite beliefs which are different in degree and centrality from groups like the Episcopal Church?

Central Values for Mennonite Worship

We should endeavor to set forth very simply what a good many of us as Mennonites take for granted as the main elements of our approach to worship. They should be re-examined and refined for our day so that they truly grow out of a Biblical theology, so that they are in line with the best experience of believers' groups in Christian history, and so that they provide a pattern which meets basic human needs today.

1. The Bible interpreted in the light of Christ Jesus is most central for our approach to worship. The Bible is not a symbol or a centerpiece for our corporate worship; rather it is functionally

central in our worship only when we use it. The use of the Bible is central because for us as humans it is the most stable, the most objective basis for communicating the Divine to us. If the Bible and revelation were not so central functionally, we would naturally need many more media, such as symbols, to make the supernatural meaningful to us. We use the Bible naturally throughout the service, including the sermon, rather than localizing its use to one particular spot and time as the lectern symbolism suggests. Because reading and preaching the Word, the Gospel-centered ministry, is central to us functionally it clearly follows that this is done from the most advantageous place available. Functional values, not symbolic, have made the pulpit central on most Mennonite platforms. Luke 4:1 ff.; Acts 3; 13:49; 17:11; 2:42; 8:4; 8:12.

2. That all Christians are to be disciples is a major objective of the Mennonite worship service. Individual members are to come to Sunday worship service with a sense of personal responsibility for preparing themselves for God's presence, rather than relying largely on the minister and the forms of worship to stimulate them. If we are personally responsible for decisions as disciples, then we must actively seek all the help we can get at home and in the church through the Bible, prayer, songs, meditation, and fellowship. Matt. 7:21; John 4:1 ff.; Matt. 10:37 ff.; John 15:8.

3. We strive to be a church such as the New Testament would have us to be. The church is a fellowship of believing disciples who worship together in hymns and spiritual songs, who help each other to do God's will and work. Singing has been a vital form of expression and a bond of our spiritual fellowship with God and man. The church is the fellowship during the week as well as on Sundays. In the total church life, there is much opportunity for "talking up" to clarify and to admonish one another, leading in prayer, and sharing through song. Though our Sunday morning worship may follow a definite orderly pattern and though our people want reverence, yet because of this fellowship of believers concept they prefer that the minister keep an atmosphere of personal Christian witness rather than one which is impersonal and formal. The communion service, too, is seen in this perspective of a fellowship of disciples rather than an individualized partaking of God's grace. "Open to all who are right with their Lord and their fellow men." Acts 2:42 ff.; Matt. 18:15 ff.; I Cor. 12:12; John 1:12; Gal. 6:1 ff.; Eph. 2:19 ff.; 5:25; I Cor. 3:9; I Pet. 2:9.

4. The spirit of reverence and worship is to come not so much from the material building and other physical stimuli, but from the

sincere attitude of believers as they look toward God and recognize the presence of the Holy Spirit. (Admittedly this is lacking at times, but is it corrected by adding more symbols?) We have thought not so much in terms of physical aids to worship as of removing obstacles to worship such as inability to hear, or the distracting ugly conditions of the building. Our emphasis has been on simplicity and honesty so that the important is more obvious. There has been effort toward harmonious adjustment to function, and within limitations a concern for correct proportions. In the more distant past we were very fearful of anything that might become an idol or a distraction from simple, direct worship. Unconsciously as it were we have preserved a philosophy of not leaning on the physical so that if need be we could stand spiritually even as refugees. John 4:1 ff.; I Pet. 2:11; Matt. 18:20; I Cor. 14:25; II Cor. 9:7.

5. The principle of Christian stewardship has had an underlying influence in several directions. Certainly it has applied to the stewardship of the Gospel, the Word, the church, the concern for the individual, and for the heritage of our approach. But the concept of stewardship has also made for modesty in building and furnishing so that the other work of the kingdom might not suffer. Matt. 12:36; 21:34-41; 25:14-30; Luke 12:33; 19:13-26. Admittedly we have not thought very much about the place for lavish, spontaneous expression of devotion which Jesus commended when the woman "wasted" "very precious ointment" on His head. Matt. 26:7.

In summary, our Mennonite emphases of worship have been maintained not in obedience to Menno Simons, but because this is what our people felt corresponded with Christ, the Bible, the early apostolic church, and the experience of believers' groups. The Bible was to be central because it is the most objective basis for knowing God in Christ. We strive to be a personalized fellowship of believers. The spirit of reverence and worship we know is basically dependent upon believing, committed worshipers. We have clearly sought to avoid reliance on physical aids so that we might not become too dependent upon them. The imperative of stewardship has made for slow changes in our worship approach and for modesty in church buildings.

We should make clear how great the contrast of these guiding values of our past is compared to those implied in the revised Gothic pattern. Below we summarize the four basic principles for church architecture as outlined by Ralph Adams Cram, the man who probably did more than anyone else to revive the medieval Gothic architecture as part of the modern liturgical movement:

(1) To be a "house of God" and to draw such respect worshipers must build into their structure wealth and reverence.
(2) To be a house set apart where the mysteries of the Christian faith are solemnized the building must be constructed around the altar as the focus of attention and interest.
(3) To create the right spiritual emotion the worshiper should be surrounded by dim shadows of mysterious aisles, sweeping arches, and shadowy vaults.
(4) "It is natural," says Leach who also upholds the liturgical trend, "to expect the architect to plan the sermon fourth in his schedule of evaluation."[5]

Modern Revival of Liturgical Worship

According to Stafford "liturgy" means, ". . . the prescribed forms of public worship of a church. . . . In its most restricted sense the word liturgy applies particularly to the ritual for the celebration of Holy Communion which is regarded as the heart of the liturgy in all Catholic churches."[6]

For the discussion which follows it is basic to note that even though there are varying degrees of high church interpretation of the Lord's Supper, the heart of any liturgical symbolism focuses around the altar. Other aspects of liturgical terminology and symbolism which should be mentioned at least to suggest the content of this system of worship aids are the paraments, vestments, reredos, dossal, gospel-side, lectern, side-pulpit, cross, candles. In the remainder of this article it is assumed that there is tremendous difference in degree between adopting some of the above individually and the adoption of the heart of liturgical symbolism itself.

For some years we have in varying degrees been part of a revival of medieval liturgical worship. This has revived interest in the medieval chancel area and made the altar the focus of the whole church building as outlined by Cram in a previous quotation. With this modern liturgical movement has come a revival of interest in medieval art, particularly the neo-Gothic and a liberal use of symbols.

Some of us may have been a part of this revival consciously, others unconsciously, particularly as we have sought to increase the psychological effectiveness of our worship service. Strictly speaking, "free" Protestant churches have not felt bound to the prescribed liturgical usage. Over a period of time, however, it has become apparent, even in the free churches, that one aspect of the liturgical

5 W. H. Leach, *Protestant Church Building* (Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1948) 85 ff.
6 A. Stafford, *Christian Symbolism in the Evangelical Churches* (Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1943) Appendix.

system in effect pushes for conformity of other aspects in order to do that which is "proper" and in "unity" with the total. This is especially true when the heart of the liturgical system, the symbolism of the altar, is adopted in worship and in architecture.

The modern liturgical revival in the Roman Catholic and Anglican churches dates from about 1920 and is concerned with "renewing the emphasis upon the worship of the church" as expressive of its historic faith and action. "The movement is concerned to stress the centrality of eucharistic worship as expressing the sacrifice of the whole church . . . as being offered to God in union with Christ's self-sacrifice."[7] This obviously is stating the strict, high church view; nevertheless it also helps explain why the altar is central for churches not quite so extreme.

An earlier revival of the liturgical movement began in the United States in 1855 with the Presbyterians publishing some liturgies. With this came a gradual changing of the architecture so that buildings were constructed with an altar-centered chancel. A Book of Worship for Free Churches, published in 1948 by Congregational ministers, explains in detail the altar, various decorations, monograms, book marks, window and stone symbols, such as the hand, the dove, tongue, triangle, fish, vine, door, rock, star, etc. Attention is given to symbolic meaning of numbers and colors. From this has come a gradually changing ministry in which the teaching aspect is increasingly small. Leading the people in "objective" worship is emphasized with the altar and semipriestly functions at the center of attention and interest.[8]

Dr. Jones, quoted above, is not alone in this Protestant reexamination of the present liturgical movement. Jesse Halsey, James Hastings Nichols, L. J. Trinterud, and others of the Chicago area were appointed as a special committee in the Presbyterian Church and prepared a very important document on this subject. They say, "Today we have the curious situation that it is the most advanced and religiously the most powerful sections of Roman Catholicism and Anglo Catholicism which come nearest to a fresh representation of the Reformed tradition, while Presbyterian churches right and left are dressing themselves up in the shopworn and castoff church furniture of the Anglo Catholic movement a century back. The modern Catholic revival nourishes itself especially on the church of the Fathers, and . . . . the Catholics often come out with Calvin and Bucer and notably ahead of the contemporary heirs of Calvin."

7 W. Norman Pittenger an article in Ferm's *Encyclopedia of Religion*, 445 ff.
8 Ilion Jones, *A Historical Approach to Evangelical Worship* (Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1954) 160.

"These Catholics, for example, stress the corporate character of worship and priesthood of the laity . . . great efforts are made to have the congregation learn to 'sing the mass.' It is now the Romans who are championing congregational singing. . . . They have discovered the Reformation sense of the Body of Christ, the communion of believers while the sons of the reformers are in danger of forgetting it."[9]

Today a growing number of leaders in Protestant churches are raising basic questions on this liturgical trend which many architects, worship writers, and ministers have taken for granted as being fully desirable. The Anabaptist approach strongly underscores their misgivings.

"Unfortunately," as Dr. Jones of the Presbyterian San Francisco Theological Seminary says, "there has not been on the part of a sufficient number of ministers and laymen enough discriminating thought about the long-range results of the movement. Instead, there has been a hasty almost blind acceptance of the current trends as the things that ought to be done because everybody else is doing them. The time has come for a thorough study to be made to determine what ought to be done about worship and why it ought to be done in the light of the basic principles of Evangelical Christianity and of the direction we want that Christianity to go in the next few centuries."[10]

Dangers of a Priestly Ritual

Historically, it is clear that Old Testament liturgy was built around the priestly system of the altar and sacrifices. The word "liturgy" in its Greek form as used in the Septuagint Old Testament means the "public work or duty" in the work of the temple priests.[11]

Judging from the high correlation in earlier history between low ethics and high liturgical worship, as in the Old Testament and the medieval Christian church, there may well be a significant relationship. Has there been the tendency of an altar-centered worship to promote a priestly ritual at the expense of the prophetic, the right life emphasis? This is not to suggest that modern liturgical leaders have not had ethical concerns, some very strong ones, nor is this to say that the liturgical system is intrinsically opposed to the ethical, but apparently the system as a whole has not encouraged the ethical. It may be that low faith and low ethics simply gravitate toward the ritualistic aspects. But it may also be that the high liturgical simply

9 James Halsey, Leslie E. Scott, A. G. Tozer, L. J. Trinterud, Chm., *A Report on Architectural Setting of Presbyterian Worship* (1953) 14.

10 Ilion T. Jones, *op. cit.*, 7.

11 Percy V. Norwood, article in Ferm's *Encyclopedia of Religion*, 445.

does not keep the "right life" in proper focus because of a diffusion of purpose through too much symbolism and ritual.

Harold DeWolf[12] also points out the peril of ritual historically in that "it may satisfy religious aspirations of the worshiper so he is not driven by his sense of the Divine to such good works as would more significantly advance the Kingdom of Righteousness. The frequent conflict between the ancient Hebrew priests and prophets and the remarkable moral leadership of the nonritualistic Quakers, afford significant evidence."

Old Testament history and that of the medieval period would suggest that when sincere individual belief of the people becomes weak there is a natural movement toward more of the priestly, semimagical ritual to hold the people and to let them experience at least a little religion. This in turn makes emphasis upon the "right life" weaker and thus accentuates the necessity toward the priestly ritual. In this manner the priestly which has a most essential place tends to become the enemy of the prophetic (right relations to man) which are equally important in God's sight.

Much of the Old Testament is a history of various prophets endeavoring to reform their people, to make them right with God and man. Moses had the vision of making a "kingdom of priests" but his vision disappeared over the years in the elaborate tabernacle system which at least held the people in the fold even if at a low level of faith and ethics. Heb. 1:1; Ex. 19:5, 6; Amos 5:25 ff.; Mic. 6:7, 8; Isa. 1:3; 19:1, 3; 1:10-17; Hos. 6:6.

The mission of the Son of God in relation to the priestly ritual is clear. God in Christ made a once-for-all sacrifice to save sinners. Was not the simple direct worship which He advocated "in spirit and in truth" the opposite of the altar-centered system of the Temple? Matt. 23:25-28. The Apostle Paul struggled with the Galatians who were strongly tempted to continue in ritualism, "O foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you, that ye should not obey the truth, before whose eyes Jesus Christ hath been evidently set forth, crucified among you? This only would I learn of you, Received ye the Spirit by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith? Are ye so foolish? having begun in the Spirit, are ye now made perfect by the flesh?" Gal. 3:1-3; John 4:1 ff.; Mark 7:3 ff.; Matt. 23:25-28; Mark 1:14, 15; Matt. 5:48; Luke 4; Matt. 10:16 ff.; 5:17, 18; 7:21; 5:23.

When in about the third century after Christ Christianity became watered-down, a semipriestly system developed first from mar-

12 Article in Ferm's *Encyclopedia*, 665.

tyrs relics to rituals, and then to holy shrines. In effect, the church borrowed and reverted back to the ancient priestly system of the Hebrew-altar worship.

The need for a drastic reformation in medieval times came from such a denial of Christ's true mission, that of bringing men into a personal saving faith and thus to a right life. Eph. 2:8-10; Rom. 12:1 ff.; Phil. 2:13.

The main Protestant reformers accomplished much by their emphasis on the Bible and personal saving faith and when they abolished the priesthood, abandoned most of the Christian year, dropped many ceremonies, modified the cathedrals they inherited, turned altars into communion tables, and changed the interpretation of the Lord's Supper. But unfortunately accepting a mass, popular state church, they refused to have a believers' church and laid the foundation for the later return to the priestly cultus in modern Protestantism.

Now, where are we? The argument of many for this priestly altar-centered worship is that human nature is unable to bear responsibilities of a pure, moral, and spiritual worship. "It is too high and exacting for the great masses of people" (Jones, p. 289). Though one may not be able to prove conclusively from history, there is enough evidence to suggest clearly that ritualism endangers rather than strengthens a proper ethical emphasis.

The Chancel Area

The technical meaning of the word "chancel" is "lattices or cross bars" to designate fences used in medieval times to fence off the holy area from the laity. As Jones and others indicate, the word chancel really should have no place in our evangelical terminology.

The development of the high church chancel area can be traced historically from the simple Lord's Supper. During the third century persecution forced the early Christians to have communion in the catacombs; here they had to use actual coffins as their tables. When the Roman Catholic Church emerged out of the persecution years, such coffins together with many other relics were greatly revered. Thus coffin-shaped tables for the Lord's Supper gradually became centers of worship and shrines. Instead of using communion tables looking like tables, the modern trend has been to imitate the coffin-like altars.

After the Reformation, worship and communion again became more of a group-affair in the audience area. The chancel area obviously became obsolete. "Various modifications were undertaken

when Protestants inherited a medieval building unsuited for congregational worship. Sometimes the screen was removed, converting two rooms into one. In other cases the screen was retained to shut off the chancel as useless and a table was set up for the people in the nave, where the pulpit was already installed on a side pillar. Sometimes the two rooms were maintained for distinct purposes, the nave for preaching services, while for communion the whole congregation moved into the chancel around the table. The chancel itself had no longer a purpose and it was simply a matter of making the best use of an architectural member which a church built for Protestant worship would never have developed."[13]

The Altar and the Communion Table

We see how the meaningful Lord's Supper of apostolic days developed into the Roman Catholic ritual in which strong symbolic value was given to the table which was never intended to be more than functional in the communion service. The real functional purpose of the Protestant communion table has also become so grown over with the mass of symbolism that it is no longer placed primarily for communion purposes. How shall we untangle ourselves, for certainly we have not made such shifts conscious of their implication and their trend?

For Anabaptists the communion table itself has not been important as a symbol of sacrifice. The communion bread and wine are the only symbols necessary to make clear Christ's sacrifice. The table has been largely functional as in New Testament days. The simple communion itself has had meaning because of our Lord's instructions and the attitude of participating believers. Communion was not just a sign of partaking of the grace of God. On this point Fritz Blanke of the University of Zurich writes, "As to the meaning attached to these new communion services in Zollikon there is precise information in the court records of the trials of the Anabaptists. Oggenfuss testifies that communion was observed in Jakob Hottinger's house from the point of view 'that they would now henceforth lead and live a Christian life.' Participation in the Lord's Supper thus included the obligation to a Chistian manner of life. Jorg Schad testifies that they broke and ate the bread with the intention that 'they would always have God in their hearts and think of Him.' The Lord's Supper was thus an obligation of love to God."[14]

From this and previous discussion on the communion table and

13 Halsey, *op. cit.*, 6 ff.
14 *Mennonite Quarterly Review* (January, 1953) 19.

altar would we not conclude that it would be best to avoid the symbol-centered, the altar-centered worship pattern? Would this also not mean that the communion table should not be placed in the strategic position of an altar, thus becoming the focus of worship? Having said this, we concede there is much room to make communion an increasingly significant service.

Center or Side Pulpit and Lectern

The emphasis of this paper thus far has been largely in the direction of not making the altar or the communion table the center of a worship system. The center pulpit is favored not for the symbolic values involved, but rather functionally to give the message from the Word of God the most advantageous position possible. There are understandable emotional reactions of the minister against being so conspicuously central, but man is necessarily involved in all leading of worship—really more conspicuously in a high church with its reverence for the pulpit and chancel area. But more important, the minister in the pulpit is not pushing himself nor even his words. He is primarily a witness.

The liturgical emphasis has asked the minister to remove himself as far as possible from the center of worship and the service. This overlooks the important Anabaptist emphasis that the minister is by the grace of God a witness. Furthermore, the Reformers emphasized the necessity of "personality" to communicate revelation, the Word. Thus despite the temptations that might come with being central on the platform, or even on the side, the minister must be helped to overcome the feelings of guilt which the liturgical emphasis may have given him and by the grace of God speak forth as a witness.

Donald G. Miller who fears that the side pulpit and lectern will subject the church more to the dangers of ritualism writes,

"It is, of course, a debatable question, but one cannot help wondering whether the resurgence of ritual in our time marks, not a real deepening of our spiritual life, not a real yearning after a more vital worship, but rather the last desperate effort of a decaying Protestantism to hide from itself its true condition. If men, in going to church, fail to have high dealings with the eternal God, they can at least, through an aesthetically designed ritual, have the emotions stirred and the feelings soothed and find some temporary escape both from the chaotic world and from the God who pursues them but whom they seek to elude. This resurgence of ritual may be Saul's last effort to conjure up the appearance of realities long since dead as a substitute for the obedience of the heart which has lapsed long

before. Harris E. Kirk some years ago described this tendency toward enrichment in worship as 'a colorful medievalism without God. . . .' "[15]

"The relation of all this to preaching is that it tends to relegate the sermon to a secondary place in the worship service, and to make men think of it as something other than worship and something less worthy than worship."[16]

It is not the purpose of this paper to defend the center pulpit, but rather to keep the most advantageous position for the preached Word, and clearly not to make it secondary to the altar symbolism.

The lectern generally is assumed to belong in the chancel together with a centered altar and a side pulpit. "The idea of a separate lectern or reading desk did not occur to these earlier Reformed leaders. . . . A separate lectern would have seemed out of place."[17]

The lectern violates the Reformed and Anabaptist concept that the sermon and the Bible are inseparably related. The Bible and its use should definitely not be localized to one spot supposedly more holy for the reading of Scripture. In the light of these factors, can we really justify a lectern? Can we justify it even if the pulpit were off to the side and needed to be balanced architecturally?

Summary

The main assumptions underlying this paper have been that the worship pattern is functionally important to any Christian group in emphasizing its central beliefs and should therefore grow out of such beliefs. Our Mennonite Church has a combination of basic Christian beliefs which we hold to be valid. The altar-centered, symbol-centered, liturgical pattern emphasizes different values and thus endangers rather than supports our Christian beliefs. Each system of truth has its own corresponding beauty and, therefore, aesthetics are not ruled out by a simple Anabaptist New Testament functionalism. We must however give more creative thought to developing a pattern of worship and architecture which grows out of and encourages our central values rather than endangers them.

15 Donald G. Miller, *Fire in Thy Mouth*, 118-21.
16 *Loc. cit.*
17 Halsey, *op. cit.*, 4.

THE ANABAPTISTS ANSWER MELANCHTHON

(I) THE HANDBUECHLEIN OF 1558

Wilhelm Wiswedel[1]

Between September 11 and October 7, 1557, a number of leading Lutheran theologians assembled at Worms on the Rhine in order to bring about a reconciliation between the Catholic and Protestant estates by way of a public conference. The experiment failed, but the theologians came to an agreement to recommend to the government of the Palatinate a sharper treatment of the Anabaptists. They recommended the application of the death penalty for all Anabaptists who could not be persuaded to return to the territorial church of their country. They formulated their recommendations in a document of that year entitled *Prozess wie es soll gehalten werden mit den Wiedertaeufern/Durch etliche Gelehrte so zu Worms versammelt gewesen, gestellt,* and signed by Philip Melanchthon, Johannes Brenz, Jacob Andreae, and several others.[2] In it the Anabaptists are called "the Devil's Spirit," and are all lumped together as "Münsterites." The execution of Michel Servetus (1553) by Calvin was heartily approved and the application of the death penalty was recommended to the government. The pretended argument of the theologians was that the Anabaptists are blasphemous, and according to Lev. 24:16, the blasphemer must not live.

One of the Anabaptist leaders in the Palatinate, Hans Büchel, who was also the spokesman for the Swiss Brethren at the Frankenthal Colloquy of 1571, ridicules this opinion of the theologians in one of his hymns in the following way:

Wer hat doch solches je gehoert
Dass man soll Christen mit dem Schwert
Zu Gottes Reich bekehren[3]

(Who has ever heard such a thing as that Christians should be converted to the kingdom of God by means of the sword)

1 This study is taken from the book by W. Wiswedel, *Bilder und Führergestalten aus dem Täufertum,* Vol. III (Oncken, Kassel, 1952), 171-83. The translation is by Robert and Betty Friedmann. Wiswedel used the handwritten copy of the *Handbüchlein* which the late Elder of the Hutterite Brethren in Canada, Elias Walter, had sent to Christian Hege, the late co-editor of the *Mennonitisches Lexikon.* This copy is now in the Mennonite Historical Library of Goshen College. Wilhelm Wiswedel is a retired Baptist pastor at Bayreuth, Germany.

2 This document is now published by G. Bossert in *Quellen zur Geschichte der Wiedertäufer,* I. Band. *Herzogtum Württemberg* (Leipzig, 1930) 161-68 under the title, *Bedenken der Wiedertäufer halben.* The identity of this *Bedenken* with the *Prozess wie es soll gehalten werden mit den Wiedertäufern* was proved by Gustav Bossert, Sen. in *Blätter für Württembergische Kirchengeschichte,* 1912, 42. (See the article "Bedenken" in *Mennonite Encyclopedia* I, 1955.)

3 Hans Büchel composed five such hymns; see Wolkan, *Die Lieder der Wiedertäufer* (Berlin, 1903) 142, and Wackernagel, *Das Deutsche Kirchenlied,* V (Leipzig, 1877) 1045-50.

The Anabaptists felt it necessary to take a stand. We read in a letter which the Strasbourg Anabaptists forwarded to Menno Simons that soon after publication of this document by the theologians a number of leading men of the different Anabaptist groups had got together to consider what should be done in this matter. They agreed to produce an answer in which the slander and malicious contentions of that document would be refuted.[4] This answer turned out to be a booklet of 107 pages entitled *Ein Handbüchlein wider den Prozess der zu Worms am Rhein wider die Brüder so man die Hutterischen nennt ausgangen ist im 1557 Jahr,*[5] completed most likely in the following year, 1558. Without doubt, it is one of the very best writings of the large Hutterite literature and permits a very good insight into the faith and life of the Hutterites. In twelve chapters (called "books") it develops the arguments of the Brethren and counters the accusation of their opponents.

(I)

The first chapter answers the charge that the Anabaptists say that magistrates and secular authority cannot be Christians, as follows:

Authorities and powers of this world are ordained by God because of the misdeeds of the people. Since man after the Fall became entangled in the flesh, God gave them authorities "which should be a rod of God's wrath and vengeance to shed the blood of those who had shed blood themselves." On the other hand they believed and confessed that according to the words of Jesus (Matt. 20:25, 26) and His own example (John 15) it became quite clear that a Christian cannot take up an office of authority which involves vengeance, wrath, killing, and shedding of blood. Otherwise the Brethren desired to be obedient to the authorities, to serve them willingly, and to do as they commanded inasmuch as it was not contrary to conscience. They paid toll and taxes and all that is due to the authorities according to the words of Paul. But whatsoever is against their most sacred con-

4 Unfortunately Wiswedel does not indicate the source where he found the reference to this Strasbourg letter to Menno Simons. The translator has not been able to find it at the present. Wiswedel's footnote at this place refers to a remark by the Anabaptist leader Diebold Winter at the Frankenthal Colloquy of 1571, in which he expressly says, "If we were such people as the *Prozess* claims, we would not be worthy to appear before your eyes." *Menn. Lex.*, I, 594.

5 As far as the translator knows, the *Handbüchlein* exists today in three copies only. The original itself seems to be lost. A 1637 copy, made in Gross-Schützen (Velky Levary), Slovakia, is at present with the Society of Brothers (New Hutterites) in Primavera, Paraguay. From this old book, formerly in Canada, two copies were made by Elias Walter, Elder of Standoff Colony, Macleod, Alberta (died in 1939). One is still at this Bruderhof, and the other is the copy mentioned in note 1. No codex of any European library has this *Handbüchlein,* which thus has completely escaped notice by European scholars. It is hard to understand how this book could become so rare, since the Brethren were quite satisfied with its contents and still today think highly of it.

victions and the testament of Christ, such as taxes for war, the spilling of blood, money for the executioner, and everything which serves the sin of injustice, that they could not pay to the authorities. The Scriptures call even the pagan authorities such as Nebuchadnezzar "servants of God," which means tools in the hands of God. Nevertheless, if they do not turn to Him, they will perish. "Therefore know ye, secular powers, that we do not condemn authorities as they claim but as we testify to the truth and recognize the grace of God, we lay bare before them their sinful life. We also try to preserve their souls through faith in Christ and to save them rather than to condemn them. For every man will be saved or condemned according to his faith or lack of faith."

(II)

In the second chapter they discuss the charge that the Anabaptists say that a Christian should neither sit in court as judge nor go to court in litigation. To this they answer with the words of Christ, "Man, who made me a judge or a divider over you?" (Luke 12:14), and, "If any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloke also" (Matt. 5:40-42). Paul likewise forbids judging (I Cor. 5). Hence it is obvious that a Christian should neither be a judge nor seek litigation.

(III)

The third "book" deals with the Anabaptist tenet that a Christian should not swear nor take an oath in the name of God. It is true that the law of Israel permitted the oath. Inasmuch, however, as Christ is the fulfillment of the law and the perfection of the spirit of grace and truth, the old law has come to its end, and that which is imperfect has to make room for that which is perfect. To "them of old time it was said: Thou shalt not forswear thyself, but shalt perform unto the Lord thine oath." Christ, however, said, "Swear not at all." The words of a Christian should be "yea" if it is yea, and "nay" if it is no, so that no one fall into hypocrisy but that the Spirit of God may live, talk or be silent in us.

(IV)

The theologians claim that the Anabaptists contend that whoever is not of their faith and church *(Gemeinschaft)* is condemned. To this the Brethren answer: we know that we are not called by God to condemn onyone, for Christ said, "Condemn not, and ye shall not be condemned" (Luke 6:37) and Paul said, "Judge not before the time, until the Lord come" (I Cor. 4:5). Therefore we confess that Christ has not sent His disciples into the world to condemn and to

judge people but we desire that all men be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth, further that we may denounce the corrupt life of this world and proclaim according to the Scriptures, "O man, know ye not that God's goodness leads you to repentance? For it is written: "I am not pleased with the death of the godless but that he change his heart and live" (Ezek. 33:11). Just as it is the will of God that all men be saved through the faith in Christ, so surely it is true what the Lord says, "If the godless does not abstain from sin and begin to do what is righteous, he will die in his sins." The Christian, however, according to Paul, is supposed to walk in righteousness before God. Therefore we would better die than continue to sin and to do that which is not right.

And thus we say: whoever is not with us in this belief and life is against us, and whoever is not gathered with us in Spirit and in Love, he disperses. Hence the believers have all reason to separate themselves from the false brethren and would-be Christians who walk inordinately and not according to the teachings of Christ, and will not share with them the yoke of unrighteousness. Thus, beloved Philip Melanchthon and Johannes Brentius together with your followers, ye shall know the answer of the Truth.

If the theologians of the new church boast of the Apostolic Creed and make it the judge of their opinion and enunciations, then the Anabaptists will let these men know that they in turn profess also fully and without reservation: "I believe in the Holy Spirit and in one Holy Christian Church and in the community of the Saints."

Unfortunately, these articles of faith are not evidenced in works among the Lutherans as they claim in the *Prozess* but they are rather a closed book to them.

(V)

The fifth book deals with the contention of the Anabaptists that infant baptism is wrong and of no use for salvation, so strongly criticized by the theologians. In answer to this the Brethren, before presenting their Scriptural grounds, quote some ancient and recent church authorities. Thus, for instance, Augustine wrote that man should repent before being baptized, which is clearly impossible for an infant. Likewise Jerome says in commenting on Matthew 28:19, that the body may not receive the sign of the sacrament of baptism unless the soul has received the truth of faith before. For that reason it was decided at the Councils of Carthage and Laodicea that the catechumen [candidate for baptism] should first learn the creed and how to live after baptism. Neither the one nor the other is comprehensible to a child. Luther in the Sermon concerning the

Mass (*Deutsche Messe,* 1526) thought that the signs [sacraments] of baptism and the Lord's Supper should not be administered without preceding faith; otherwise these signs are like a smith without iron, a jewelbox without jewel, a sign in front of an inn which has no wine.

Next Zwingli is quoted (in his tract *Against Faber*) and Cellarius, who in an epistle has written that infant baptism is an abomination before God, since it is not testified to either by the Scriptures or by the example of the apostles. . . . "Therefore, beloved Philip Melanchthon, we will not yield to you to consider infant baptism to be right."

True Scriptural baptism is only the baptism of the believers. To be sure, nowadays they speak of "infused faith" (*eingegossener Glaube*). It was Augustine who used this term for the first time, and after him Luther used it again when he argued against Zwingli at Marburg (1529). He also used another argument first presented by Origen in the latter's Epistle to the Romans, namely, that infant baptism had been ordained by the apostles. That is the ground on which the Lutherans stand. Zwingli on his part points to circumcision as the covenant of God with Abraham. That was for the Swiss reformers the reason for infant baptism.

Thus the theologians twist the Scriptures. Christ talks to Nicodemus not of external baptism with water, as the pope and his followers understand it, but rather of the inner baptism of the Spirit, of the necessity of being born again and of leading a saintly life, which obviously only the adults can do. Hebrews 11:6 (quoted by Luther at Marburg) applies exclusively to adults, challenging them to strength and courage of faith. An infant has neither faith nor does he know anything about reward.

Zwingli's reference to circumcision relies more on the law of the Old Testament than on the grace of the New Testament. Peter calls baptism a covenant of a good conscience with God (I Peter 3:21). Infants know neither good nor evil; and God the Almighty through the death and resurrection of Christ has made the innocent children free. Baptism by water saves no soul.

Reference to the vicarious faith of the godparents has little value either, for it is known that it was invented by the eighth pope after Christ, called Cainus.

(VI)

The sixth book deals with the breaking of the bread by the saints. The Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation is rejected, for God Himself says that the transformation of His Son takes place in

the seed of those who are holy and not in the dead elements of bread and wine. But neither is the interpretation of Luther acceptable, according to which the bread and wine remain in their own nature, yet under the form of bread and wine the essential body and blood of the Lord are partaken. This appears to the Brethren like blasphemy. While the pope teaches that the dead and visible elements of wine and bread themselves are God Himself, Luther teaches an invisible and hidden Christ and God in the form of the dead elements. Christ, however, dwells neither in the magic of the priests nor in the essence of the dead elements but alone in the hearts of the believers. Christ left His Supper not to the world but only to those who out of God's grace have become one vine, one body, one mind, and one will with the death and resurrection of the Son of God.

(VII)

The seventh book deals with the question of original sin. The theologians found fault with the brethren's teaching that children have no original sin. To this the Brethren answer: We confess that all human beings born after Adam are under the curse of original sin which makes for death and eternal damnation. Christ, however, is the reconciliation of the whole world (John 3:16), including the little children. From this follows that original sin brings only physical but not eternal death with children prior to that time when original sin stirs the heart and incites to real sinning. And that is so that the word may be fulfilled that the children should not die for the iniquities of their fathers (Ezek. 18:17, 20) but every man shall be put to death for his own sin (Deut. 24:16).

The Scriptures know of three kinds of original sin:

(a) Adam fell and thus drew all posterity with him in his fall. Sin passed upon all men (Rom. 5:12). In this kind of sin also the little children participate and it works with them as with the adults for physical death, but not farther. But just as by one man's sin and disobedience all men became sinners, so also by one man's obedience the many have become just. From this we learn that the little ones who know neither right nor left stand under the blessed grace of God which works for eternal life through Jesus Christ the Lord.

(b) Another kind of original sin is the inclination to sin which stirs all human hearts. Paul says that Satan's angel beats him with fists lest he become presumptuous, and John writes: "If we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves" (I John 1:8). The heart of man tends to evil things from early youth. But we say nevertheless that if

the inclination toward sin is not put into work and unrighteousness, then it does not work for damnation or eternal death. For there is no condemnation to those who are in Christ Jesus (Rom. 8:1). The inclination is overcome by the power of the Lord.

(c) The third inheritance of original sin has no power over the believer in Christ. "Whosoever is born of God does not commit sin" (I John 3:9). Such a one will guard himself and will fight sin.

(VIII)

The eighth chapter begins with the accusation of the theologians that the Anabaptists contend that God may be recognized without the preaching of His Holy Word. To this the Brethren answer: we do not think that God makes Himself known without the hearing of the preached Word, for that would mean minimizing the order which was established by God. For with Paul we speak, "The church thanks God without ceasing for such gifts when she receives the word of divine preaching which we do not receive as the word of man but as the true word of God which effectually works in those who believe" (I Thess. 2:13). For we know very well that God could have given to Saul the gift of the Holy Spirit and His vision without any human means, but He did not want to disturb His holy order, and for that it was left to Ananias to do it as a means and tool of God. Therefore Paul says, "Faith cometh from hearing." Likewise Christ has said, "Go out into the world and preach."

But the external word which is preached to the people of the world is but a copy of and reference to the internal word by which alone the believer becomes aware of the grace and power of God. Not the hearer but the doer of works of righteousness is agreeable and pleasing to God (James 1:22).

To prove that the Brethren do not think little of the written and preached word they point to the fact that in their church *(Gemeinde)* they select worthy men according to the rule of the primitive church and of the apostles as missioners to the people to give testimony to the life of Christ and His church.

(IX)

The ninth book deals with the doctrine of the Trinity in which allegedly the Anabaptists do not believe. Against such lies the Brethren protest vigorously. They confess and believe in one eternal Son of God in the counsel and providence of divine wisdom, which mystery was hidden in that counsel but now has been revealed as the Son of God in all His power, etc. Therefore we say with Paul that Christ according to the flesh derives from the seed of Judah and

David, but according to the Spirit He is God Himself, blessed in all eternity. Likewise, John makes very clear that "we are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God and eternal life" (I John 5:20).

And now, beloved Philippus Melanchthon and Johannes Barentius and all of you in the Lutheran Church, you may judge whether or not we believe in the doctrine of the Eternal Son and of the Holy Spirit. In fact, what you accuse us of may often be found with you. We, however, in all simplicity of heart will not deviate from the doctrine of the Eternal Son and the Holy Spirit, neither with works nor words, and would rather suffer death to the glory of God through Jesus Christ.

(X)

In the tenth book we read that the theologians charge the Anabaptists with the teaching that if one of their church has been born again he cannot ever fall into the wrath of God again, and even if he would commit adultery they would claim to have been prompted by the Holy Spirit [antinomianism].

This point makes the writer of the *Handbüchlein* particularly bitter. Here, he says, the Lutheran prophets have slandered with their "tyrannical" *Prozess Büchlein* the truth of God and the life of the God-fearing ones in the eyes of the whole world.

To keep the commandments of God is not a matter of human judiciousness *(menschlichem Vermoegen)* and the power of man, rather it is God Himself who works in His believers both the desire for and the fulfillment of these laws so that no flesh may boast. Whoever wants to boast should do so in the Lord. Therefore, you fighters of the Lutheran Church, listen to our answer: We confess that the new birth in Christ is truly a mortification and dying of the old Adamitic flesh and sinful life, as Christ said to Nicodemus, "That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is Spirit." And that is heavenly and holy life. Whatever, on the other hand, is born of the flesh is nothing but sinful and condemnable life. This renewal and holy birth the world does still not understand in our days.

Although God wants His children to walk without fail to the glory of the name of Jesus, we nevertheless do not teach that such a newborn man could not sin or do evil any longer, or that he could not leave heaven and choose hell. Oh, no, that is not the teaching of the truth, for Christ says expressly, even though the unclean spirit is gone out of a man, he yet walks through dry places, seeking rest and finding none. Then he says, "I will return into my house," etc. (Matt.

12:43-45). And Paul admits that Demas had left him and found pleasure in the world. John, too, writes: "If we say that we have no sin we deceive ourselves and truth is not with us" (I John 1:8).

From all this it becomes obvious that the believer has to struggle for his salvation. As long as he is fighting soldierlike in the faith of Christ and will not let himself be dominated by sin, we declare emphatically that in the newborn man the glory of God is reflected. But whenever man allows sin to enter his work, then he is an image of lies and of the devil. For that reason a sinner excludes himself so-to-speak from the community; but if he repents thoroughly, then we extend the hand of brotherhood to him again.

If the Lutheran scribes accuse us in this article and try to disparage us without any foundation, then we call them liars and revilers, and they will receive their sentence on the Day of Judgment.

(XI)

The eleventh book deals with the contention of the theologians that the Anabaptists teach that man becomes justified by his own fulfillment of the law [work righteousness and perfectionism].

Answer: Law is a statement in which the right thing is commanded and the wrong one prohibited. Law makes man guilty and frightens him because of sin. For that reason if the salvation of Christ as the fulfiller of the law would not have come into this world, the law would yet have brought eternal death to man and kept him prisoner.

The law was given through Moses, which law demands more than can be fulfilled. Grace and truth were given to us for our salvation through Jesus Christ, from which follows that we may say with Paul that Christ is the end of the law for everyone who believes; further that everything derives from God's grace and mercy and in no way from one's own merit of human righteousness and piety. As Paul says, that no flesh should boast, but whoever wants to boast may boast of the gift and grace of God.

Therefore, you Lutheran slanderers, we do not say that man may become justified before God of his own merit and the fulfillment of the law, since the latter was nothing but a sealing and testing of divine discipline until that time when the saints become completely revealed in Christ Jesus, in whose name our unrighteousness is forgiven and our sins covered up. But God did not save us through Christ that we now may feel free to indulge into the lusts of sin and commit works of unrighteousness. That would be blaspheming the name of God. The Lutherans in particular by their doctrine of the

"spiritual law of Christ" are badly in error and strengthen the minds of the unjust. They boast of the great grace and faith, but it is an empty and dead faith. From their public acts everyone can see that they confess God by the mouth but deny Him in their heart by their doings. On the basis of a number of Bible texts the Anabaptists now try to demonstrate that faith must necessarily be followed by a saintly life and good deeds, otherwise it is not a saving faith.

But you, Lutherans, should not think that the true believers overestimate these good works beyond their meaning. The willing and fulfillment is not the work of man, but it is God Himself who does it. For that reason the believer must turn to God daily with his supplication and prayer that he may be able through divine strength to fulfill and keep the law of faith. This duty and obedience which God requires from all men, most people want to throw off their shoulders and pay God with their empty and dead faith only, while the Scriptures expressly say that faith must become active in love.

In Summa: the Lutheran Church sings and shouts: believe, believe, and that is all, in short they act like unfaithful servants. They do not do what they owe to God and which is His sacred command.

(XII)

The last chapter of the *Handbüchlein* deals with the accusations of the Lutherans concerning the upbringing of small children among the Anabaptists. The *Prozess* of 1557 has this to say on the subject: "We know that the way of communal life in Moravia is an immoral one, and it is particularly cruel that they take away the young children from their parents and that they should be brought up all alike in a common school, and that many children die because of hunger and other neglects. In Summa, such devilish communism is an impossible thing against all nature and law."

Answer: You Lutherans should know that our children are dear to us in our hearts before God according to the truth, and that we are most concerned about them. Of that God Himself will bear testimony on the Day of Judgment. Then our slanderers would learn that they have reviled unjustly the way we bring up our children. The children are conscientiously taken care of and educated; it is our endeavor to bring up the children in divine discipline, and to plant in their hearts the right morals and commandments of God.

Now mark well the way of our discipline:

(1) When a child is two or three years of age the parents bring him to the school for the little ones. Here they learn first the sacred prayer.

(2) As soon as he knows the prayer and has some understanding, he is taught to do something useful with his hands, the boys with reading and writing, the girls with spinning and sewing, in order to prevent them from tending to mischief.

(3) The children are supervised by assigned sisters and school mothers, and there is also a schoolteacher. They all guide the children in all their daily work including eating and drinking, going to bed and getting up, both outdoors and indoors, so that everything may be done in good discipline, and the young people brought up to the glory of God.

(4) At mealtimes the children are taught to give thanks to God before and after meals with folded hands. In school one boy gets up and prays aloud before the others.

(5) Before the children go to bed and also in the morning when they are awakened, the schoolteacher calls all boys and girls together to common prayer. About once a week the teacher gives the children instructions and admonitions in a God-fearing life.

(6) One sister together with an assistant keeps the nightwatch, as the need requires. They have to take care of the children throughout the night and provide them with all the needs of the body.

In conclusion the author of the *Handbüchlein* addresses himself once more to the Lutheran theologians. Inasmuch as they remind all worldly authorities of the Old Testament law that one should kill a blasphemer (Lev. 24:16), they present them with a good tool against the Anabaptists. But Jesus says that whoever does not heed the evangelical teachers [ministers] should be considered a pagan and a publican. But he does not say he should be killed.

Paul says: shun a man of false beliefs (I Tim. 6:5), but he does not say that one should put him into the stocks. Peter enjoins that one should pasture the flock with a willing heart but not with fire, water, and sword.

The Lutheran teachers may command the faith of a country, but they are certainly not promoting the joy in Christ.

An evangelical missioner should use the sword of the Spirit, which would make known to man the sin in his heart which leads him away from wrong and which quickens the soul and assures him of eternal life in faith in Jesus before God and man.

But such sacred office, work, and service God has not entrusted to a tyrannical and pugnacious church which has in mind but violence and evil things.

Nowadays a God-fearing man has nothing to expect but bondage and the rope. To this the Lutheran preachers contribute in no small way as becomes so obvious in the *Prozess*. The believers, however, are called to cling to what they have, that no one may take away from them the crown of glory.

(II) SOME FURTHER STUDIES PERTAINING TO THE HANDBUECHLEIN OF 1558

Robert Friedmann

(1)

Wilhelm Wiswedel has given us in a very gratifying way a condensation of the contents of the *Handbüchlein*. It is now up to a historian of Anabaptism to add a few more remarks to clarify and elucidate the place of this interesting Anabaptist tract and its significance in the whole of the Left-Wing thinking of the sixteenth century. We may begin in this endeavor with a rather weighty statement: namely that in the entire corpus of Hutterite doctrinal writings this tract stands about in the third place. First is Peter Riedemann's great *Account of our Religion* of 1540 (printed 1565), a book of uncontested excellence and representative character.[1] Second is the great *Article Book,* first drawn up in 1545-47 during the discussions with former Gabrielite brethren who wanted to rejoin the brotherhood in Moravia.[2] The great chronicle of the Hutterian Brethren contains (listed to the year 1547) a section entitled, *Die Fuenf Artikel des Groessten Streits zwischen uns und der Welt (Geschicht-Buch,* ed. Wolkan, 208-40). Later, most likely not before 1577, Peter Walpot, then the bishop of the entire brotherhood, wrote an elaboration of this section which from now on becomes known as the "Great Article Book," present in numerous codices. It contains a summary of the five most important articles by which the Brethren distinguished themselves from all other groups. And now, number three is our present tract in which the Brethren not only gave an answer to the accusations of the Lutheran theologians at Worms (1557), but in which they formulated again in twelve chapters their major arguments for their particular way of life and for its underlying faith. Since this tract is in a sense the official answer to

1 Compare F. Heimann, "The Hutterite Doctrine of Church and Common Life, a study of Peter Riedemann's Confession of Faith of 1540," MQR XXVI (1952) 22 ff. and 142 ff.; an English edition of it came out in 1950 (Plough Publishing House in England).

2 Cf. the article "Article Book" in the forthcoming volume I of the *Mennonite Encyclopedia* (1955).

Lutheranism, it assumes a significance far beyond the concrete historical situation which prompted it.

John Oyer's[3] research has shown that we know something about the mood of the Lutheran theologians. Melanchthon and his colleagues were by no means as ignorant about Anabaptist doctrines and views as, for instance, Martin Luther still was. Too many imprisoned Brethren had testified to their faith before courts, and had put down on record what they were willing to die for if need be. With a number of them the Lutheran theologians had had disputes right in their prison cells. Thus when at Worms they condemned Anabaptism they did so in an official function. They did not use the excuse of Münsterite plottings, nor did they accuse the Anabaptists of fanaticism *(Schwaermerei* and *Geisttreiberei)* as Luther had done for lack of better information. This time it was clearly an enunciation of the new and by now well-established state church that no sectarianism of any kind was to be tolerated no matter what arguments would be presented. Of course "Anabaptism" served as a collective name for all kinds of nonconformity and Melanchthon made no distinction between Swiss Brethren, Hutterian Brethren, Anti-Trinitarians (Servetus!), and the illuminates (like David Joris). He lumped together all deviants from the official line[4]—and condemned them uniformly. The theological master argument at this point of historical development was simply this: the Anabaptists were not heretics (Luther had counseled gentleness in such cases) but blasphemers, and as such to be punished by death according to Lev. 24:16. Melanchthon was quite wild when thinking of these radicals who threatened the very existence of the new state churches in German lands; to him they all were of the devil, and there was no distinction between good and bad Anabaptists. How else could he understand that they consistently resisted the well-ordered state church and its well-reasoned theology? Whoever put himself outside the state (hence declared himself "against" the state) was seditious even though asserting fully his pacifistic intentions. The 1557 document (the *Prozess)* was incidentally by no means Melanchthon's first dealing with these nonconformists; in the 1530's he had not less than five times given his opinion, listed all of the "false doctrines" (quite true to fact) of the Anabaptists, suggested refutation of these teachings and counseled the death penalty.[5]

We should not forget that the kind of Anabaptism which Me-

3 John Oyer, "The Writings of Melanchthon Against the Anabaptists," *MQR* XXVI (1952) 259-79. Also G. Bossert, Jr., in *Blätter für Württembergische Kirchengeschichte,* 1929, 25.

4 Oyer, *loc. cit.,* 278.

5 Oyer, *loc. cit.,* 279, lists all writings of Melanchthon against the Anabaptists; those of the 1530's were issued in 1531, 1535, and 1536.

lanchthon and his colleagues were fighting was not the Moravian or Hutterite type but actually that of the Swiss Brethren (in the widest sense of the term); that is, the Anabaptism of the Brethren in Saxony, Thuringia, Hesse, the Palatinate, and the Rhineland, areas where the idea of such brotherhoods had spread ever since its beginning in Zurich in 1525. Most of these Brethren (in and out of prison) were in no way leaders, and Melanchthon therefore had most likely a rather vague and indistinct idea of the real nature of Anabaptism, in spite of all contacts. After all, what a man detests he will not study too carefully. Even hazier was what he and his colleagues knew of Moravia and the Hutterite way. In fact in the entire Worms document there is but one brief remark concerning the Hutterites, namely, the condemnation of their collectivistic upbringing of their small children, which Melanchthon calls an obscene and devilish institution.[6]

For that reason it is all the more remarkable that not Swiss Brethren (for instance in Strasbourg or in the Rhineland) but Hutterites should "answer Melanchthon," and the only explanation might be that they had at this time more capable men to do this than other groups who in the ceaseless persecutions had lost nearly all their fine leaders of the beginning.[7] Perhaps there was only in Moravia a chance of quietly studying such accusations and formulating the proper defense or refutation, even though the attack was not specifically made against this group. At least it was made also against them.

It is not known who composed this "answer." Assuming that it originated in Moravia, and that it was drawn up rather soon after "Worms" (1557), not too many capable Anabaptist leaders come into consideration. Peter Riedemann had died in 1556,[8] leaving as *Vorsteher* only his colleague Leonhard Lanzenstiel (d. 1565), a man, though able otherwise, not really given to a work of this kind. The only one intellectually on a par with Riedemann was Peter Walpot (d. 1578), the author of the well-known School Discipline of 1568, of the Great Article Book of 1577, and most likely of many official documents of the brotherhood in Moravia ever since his ordination as a minister in 1542. Even though the *Handbüchlein* must be pronounced a collective work of the brotherhood as a whole and not as the private opinion of one particular brother, it yet is clear that the

6 G. Bossert, *Quellen zur Geschichte des Täufertums*, Vol. I, *Württemberg* (Leipzig, 1930) 166, lines 14-19.

7 Thomas of Imbroich was executed in 1558. Menno Simons and Dirk Philips lived far away and most likely knew of the Worms document only through the Strasbourg letter, mentioned in Wiswedel's study.

8 In the same year also Pilgram Marpeck had died in Augsburg.

first draft had to be made by one man capable of such work. Inevitably we look at this brother Peter Walpot as the one who might have drawn up the main points of the arguments (just as he most likely had drawn up the main points of the anonymous Article Book). Several arguments speak in his favor, above all his unusual knowledge of church history (primarily concerning the issue of infant baptism) which reveals itself both in the *Handbüchlein* and the Article Book. We find in the *Handbüchlein* references to Origen, Jerome, Augustine, councils and popes, also to Luther *(Deutsche Messe),* Zwingli *(Contra Fabrum),* Cellarius, and many more. These references are not unlike those to be found in the Article Book.[9] As possible sources for such quotations I would know only three: Sebastian Franck's *Chronica* of 1531,[10] Stoffel Eleutherobios' booklet *Vom wahrhaftigen Tauff Johannis, Christi und der Aposteln. Wann und wie der Kindertauff angefangen und eingerissen hat* (1528, second edition 1550),[11] and of course the old stand-by: Eusebius' *Church History* (about A.D. 325). Besides these three known sources more anonymous material (derived from humanistic sources) must have circulated everywhere among the Brethren, as for instance the contemporary *Confession of Faith* by Thomas of Imbroich (martyred 1558) so strikingly proves. Needless to say, the Brethren were no scholars. But when it was necessary to defend their stand on adult baptism, they knew quite well where to find arguments in their favor. Some contacts with itinerant booksellers and even with humanistic scholars must have existed throughout the century. We should not forget either that one of the first Anabaptists was Dr. Balthasar Hubmaier, himself a well-versed scholar.

(2)

Our next task would be a comparison of the "answers" of the *Handbüchlein* on the one hand with the actual accusations of the *Prozessbüchlein* on the other hand. Such a comparison could prove to be quite instructive by demonstrating how the Brethren understood all those accusations of "false teachings" and also which one they thought particularly in need of defense. The Worms document distinguished two kinds among the doctrines of the Brethren which Melanchthon considered "diabolic": (1) seditious lies (five points) and (2) nonseditious lies (seven points).[12] It is worth noting that the

9 Cf. R. Friedmann, "Eine dogmatische Hauptschrift," etc. in *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte,* XXVIII (1931) 233 ff.

10 About the *Chronica* by Sebastian Franck cf. the article "Chronica" by Friedmann in the forthcoming volume I of the *Mennonite Encyclopedia* (1955).

11 Concerning Eleutherobios (Freisleben) cf. *ML* I, 551 (enlarged it will also appear in vol. II of *Menn. Encycl.*) and Ulrich Bergfried, *Verantwortung als theologisches Problem, im Täufertum des 16. Jahrhunderts* (Wuppertal, 1938).

12 Oyer, *loc. cit.,* 276.

answer was given in twelve books (really chapters), which however do not always correspond to the above-named charges. In the following table the claimed charges are listed first while the corresponding incriminations by Melanchthon follow in the second column.

Handbüchlein (1558-59)	*Prozessbüchlein* (1557) (listed by J. Oyer, *loc. cit.*, 276)
What the theologians say that the Anabaptists teach:	*Seditious lies*
Book 1: That magistrates cannot be Christians	Number one: Civil & princely offices are sinful and damned
" 2: That Christians should not judge and be judges	Number three: Suits in civil courts are sinful
" 3: That Christians should not swear oaths	Number four: Swearing of oath is sin
" 4: Whoever is not of their Anabaptist faith and community is damned	(cf. Bossert, *loc. cit.*, 164)
" 5: Infant baptism is wrong and of no use	*Nonseditious lies:* Number two: Infant baptism is is wrong
" 6: Concerning the Supper and the breaking of bread (it is not a sacrament)	Number five: The sacrament is but an external sign, not a means of grace
Book 7: That children have no original sin	Number one: Christ has no original sin, hence man is no longer bound by original sin
" 8: God reveals Himself without hearing the preached Word	Number four: God reveals Himself directly, besides the Word and sacrament (illumination)
" 9: Anabaptists do not believe the doctrine of the Son and of the Holy Ghost	Number three: Anabaptists believe in the Jewish God, and do not teach either Son or Holy Ghost (Unitarianism)
" 10: Whoever is reborn cannot again fall under the wrath of God; he is always driven by the Spirit	Number seven: The new or reborn ones cannot fall back under the wrath of God
" 11: Man becomes justified (or righteous) through the fulfillment of the law	Number 6: Man becomes justified or righteous through rebaptism, through suffering, and through the fulfillment of the law
" 12: Concerning the care of the children and their discipline	(Bossert, 166, lines 14-19)

It is surprising that the Brethren did not answer charges Nos. 2 and 5 of the "seditious lies," namely, that "all Christians are obliged to practice community of goods" (2) and "an Anabaptist should leave his non-Anabaptist spouse" (5). If the *Handbüchlein* had originated with the Swiss Brethren, claim No. 2 would have been wrong, hence easily answered, but that Hutterites who so passionately defended the idea of complete community of goods should have omitted this point is certainly hard to explain. Charge No. 5 (divorce of the unbelieving partner of married life) was likewise a rather familiar

theme among the Brethren. Article Five of the Great *Article Book* deals extensively just with this issue. Again we do not know the reason why no particular "book" was devoted to this most important point.

On the other side two "books" deal with accusations which Melanchthon apparently considered of only secondary significance, namely, "that anyone not of their church is damned" (book 4) and "to bring up children in communities (as in Moravia) is obscene and diabolic" (book 12). The latter charge covers but five lines in the printed Worms document, which lines John Oyer characterizes as "a slight diversion to blast the Hutterite Brethren with their communistic practices" (*loc. cit.*, 274). Obviously this was to the theologians a point of objection distinct from the above-named "seditious lie" number two (all Christians are obliged to practice community of goods) although in reality the educational system of the Hutterites had been a direct outgrowth of the principle of community of goods.

(3)

As we now enter a study of some of the answers of the Anabaptists certain observations concerning their theological foundations can be made which might be helpful toward a proper understanding of Anabaptist thinking, as it had developed in their controversies and their opposition to the great Protestant theological systems of a Luther or a Zwingli.

The most intriguing issue is, no doubt, that concerning original sin and its consequences; here the gap between the two theologies becomes particularly striking. On this issue the author or authors of the *Handbüchlein* could well refer back to important earlier statements in this line such as by Ulrich Stadler or Peter Riedemann. The role or function of "original sin" in man's life was from the very beginning of the Reformation a fundamental issue for Luther on the one side and for the Anabaptists on the other side. Luther was a radical "Augustinian" in this regard: we all are sinners at all times and cannot ever do any good. Hence we never can have a "good conscience" (I Peter 3:21)—as Anabaptists claim—and are thrown upon God's mercy in all our wretchedness and the sacrament of His Word which delivers us without any merit on our part, alone by and for believing. To this the Anabaptists rejoined: certainly, by inheritance we all derive from Adam mortality, our physical death, which, however, is not the same as eternal death (or hell). This inheritance (German, *Erbsünde*—hereditary sin or guilt; the Brethren were quick to discover that this word does not occur at all in the

text of the New Testament) produces in all of us an inclination to sin which, however, in itself does not yet make us "sinners" (in the Gospel sense), that is, doers of sinful acts. Man can resist the temptation to such acts by virtue of his inner rebirth or change of mind and hereafter by inner discipline. That is, man can at least try to live a clean life, agreeable to God (what the Scriptures call having a "good conscience"), although the struggle will last to the very end of life. Children, who are not yet mature and understanding, have in this sense no sin and they will certainly not go to hell if they should die in infancy since Christ had also died for them.

Thus far this is Anabaptist teaching in general. New and original with the Hutterites is the argument that the idea of "hereditary guilt" *(Erbschuld)* is contrary to all the teachings of the Holy Scriptures. Did not the Prophet Ezekiel expressly state (18:17 and 20) that "the children shall not bear the iniquities of their fathers [referring back to Deut. 24:16], but he who sinneth shall himself die"[13]? Peter Riedemann deals in his great *Rechenschaft* of 1540 at some length with this issue, "The Harm Wrought by Original Sin" (*loc. cit.,* 212), where the above argument is found perhaps for the first time.[14] But he hastens to add, as two decades later also the *Handbüchlein,* that a real turning point *(eine rechte Wiederkehr)* is possible, that is, men are able to deny their former ways in true repentance and can attempt to walk the path of righteousness. In other words, the question arises here whether a "church without spot and wrinkle" is possible or only an illusion (as most Protestants thought). More than once did Anabaptists face this issue—it was in fact their most crucial one—and more than once did they affirm this possibility in all humbleness, and evidenced their faith in practice.

In this connection "book" ten is of particular interest because in it the Brethren deny having ever taught that "once a man has been born again he can never again fall under the wrath of God even if he should commit adultery afterwards." Melanchthon claimed that in such a case the Brethren would excuse themselves by saying that the Holy Ghost Himself had driven them to such acts. It is apparent that Anabaptists never taught anything like that and that Melanchthon here was thinking of the "antinomianism" of certain radical "spiritualists" or illuminates like David Joris. The evangelical Anabaptists knew only too well the precariousness of the

13 Cf. R. Friedmann, "Peter Riedemann on Original Sin and the Way of Redemption," in *MQR,* 1952, 210-15.

14 Also Ulrich Stadler wrote different tracts on Original Sin (around 1536); cf. Lydia Müller, *Glaubenszeugnisse Oberdeutscher Taufgesinnter* (Leipzig, 1938) 228 ff., and 233 ff. The latter passage begins as follows: "Das Wort Erbsünd hat in der ganzen Heiligen Schrift keinen Grund, ja ist auch gar nicht darin geschrieben." However, the Riedemann argument based on Ezekiel 18 is not yet familiar to Stadler.

"narrow path" which never safeguards complete freedom from temptation and exclusion from the inclination *(Neiglichkeit)* to sin. Only strictest discipline both by oneself and by the brotherhood as a responsible whole could control such an endeavor in the "new life." But then a new tone rings throughout this book of defense. We mean here the resigned recognition that the world in general (and the official Christians in particular) simply cannot understand what rebirth really means. "We confess," the *Handbüchlein* solemnly states in Book Ten, "that the new birth is truly a mortification and dying of the old Adamic flesh and all sinful life in the belief in the Son of God. . . . This renewal and sacred birth [means] that such a person no longer desires to commit sins."[15]

Here we recognize clearly that the issue is no longer one of theology where a certain argument is played out against another argument, but it is an issue of Christian existence whereby all arguments vanish before the actual living in obedience and discipline. It is in this sense that Anabaptism might be called an expression of "existential Christianity."

(4)

In spite of all this inner significance our *Handbüchlein* did not attract as much attention as other writings of the Brethren. The original book is lost, and no European library contains any copy of it, which explains why scholars like Beck, Loserth, and Wolkan were completely ignorant of its existence.

In 1637, a certain Hutterite brother Bartl Fligl of Levar (Gross-Schützen, Slovakia) made a handwritten copy of it while learning to write in the school of the Brethren.[16] This is the only old copy which has been preserved to the present. And yet in spite of this relative rarity, our book was still to exert an influence far beyond its original cause.

Johannes Waldner, the writer of the *Smaller Chronicle* or *Kleingeschichtbuch der Hutterischen Brüder,* reports in it how the Lutheran transmigrants from Carinthia (of whom he himself was one when still a small child) arrived in Transylvania in 1756 and how they settled down near Alvintz and Creutz. There they came into contact with the remnants of the "old" Hutterites (hardly more than twenty or thirty adults) and soon got to liking their way. Thereupon these Hutterites gave them their books to read that they could

15 "Wir bekennen, dass die Neugeburt ist wahrhaftig eine Tötung und Absterbung des alten adamischen Fleisches und sündlichen Lebens im Glauben des Sohnes Gottes. Diese Erneuerung und heilige Geburt versteht noch heutigen Tags die ganze Welt nicht, nämlich dass ein neugeborener Mensch nicht möge sündigen."

16 Von mir Bärtl Fligl, hab dieses Büchl geschrieben in der Schul zu Lebär bei dem Hans Blössig [Blössinger].

learn the foundations upon which they stood in faith and living. Among these books were the *Rechenschaft* by Riedemann and also our *Handbüchlein*.[17] Obviously it was most fitting to the occasion since it was "the" answer of the Brethren to Lutheranism, the present faith of these newcomers. Now these men should learn all the arguments why a life according to the Gospel may not be found in the Lutheran faith but in that of the Anabaptist Brethren. The *Kleingeschichtbuch* goes on, saying that these Carinthian men were profoundly impressed by all that the *Rechenschaft* and the *Handbüchlein* had to say, and not long afterwards they gave up their former faith and joined the brotherhood, thus fusing completely into the life of the small flock present. It meant the saving of the brotherhood for centuries to come.

It may also be reported that the *Handbüchlein* had a similar effect in more recent times (about 1930). When Dr. Eberhard Arnold in Germany and his group sought closer contacts with the Hutterites, it was again this book which influenced deeply the decisions of the group. That the Society of Brothers (now in Primavera, Paraguay) were finally organized along Hutterite lines is at least in part due to the study of this *Handbüchlein*. The only existing seventeenth-century copy of it is today one of the most cherished possessions of this brotherhood in Paraguay.

17 *Klein-Geschichtsbuch der Hutterischen Brüder*, ed. A. J. F. Zieglschmid (1947) 274.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL AND RESEARCH NOTES

THE ANABAPTISTS IN ENGLISH LITERATURE

A RESEARCH NOTE

IRVIN B. HORST*

References to Anabaptists are fairly numerous in English literature, particularly in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Many problems arise when one undertakes to identify and interpret these passages. To what extent is the name used specifically in reference to contemporary groups and generically to designate "separatists" or even "heretics" in general? Historically who were the Anabaptists in England and what were their distinctive beliefs and practices? Until these and other questions are investigated more fully, it will be difficult to explain the references, and, what is of interest to the literary student, to estimate the extent and significance of Anabaptist subject matter and concepts in English literature. The purpose of this note is to call attention to some of these references, to point out the studies already made on the subject, and to suggest possible areas for further study and research. No attempt is made to cover the field in an exhaustive fashion. The word "literature" is used particularly in the aesthetic sense but also generally to designate the total body of writing. At present students of English literature consider everything written until 1600 as their legitimate field of study and research, and in some quarters the line has advanced well into the seventeenth century with interest in theological writings. The following references have been identified for the greater part by the occurrence of the name "Anabaptist" without entering into the critical problems involved. On the basis of subject content the passages may be grouped under three headings: (1) allusions to seditious Anabaptism, particularly the Münster episode, (2) comment on topical Anabaptism, usually satirical in nature, (3) discussion of Anabaptist belief and practice in theological tracts and treatises. Under a fourth heading some observations will be made about the influence of Anabaptist concepts in English literature.

I. *Allusions to Seditious Anabaptism*

The rise and fall of the Anabaptists at Münster was seized upon as grist for many kinds of writing. *A treuue nyeuu tydynges of the wonderfull worckes of the Rebaptisers of Münster* (1535) was a newsbook published contemporary with the events. The only recorded extant copy is found in the Folger Library at Washington. Sir Thomas More in *The second parte of the confutacion of Tyndals answere* (1533) briefly describes the alleged excesses of certain continental Anabaptists. In an earlier pamphlet, by William Barlow, *A dyaloge descrybyng the orygynall ground of these Lutheran faccyons* (1531), the Anabaptists are described at length on the basis of firsthand acquaintance. The usual tale is told in this dialogue but not without some comment on their piety, and they are called the "third faction" of the Reformation with origins in the Zwinglian movement. This tract was reprinted in 1555 during the reign of Mary. Barlow's tract is a propaganda piece done during an interim

* Irvin B. Horst is a candidate for the Ph.D. degree in history at the Free University of Amsterdam, with a dissertation on the Anabaptists in England.

support of the Catholic party and any references from it must be used cautiously.

In John Bale's *King John,* sometimes called the first history play in English literature, two significant references to Anabaptists occur. In the first of these mention is made of Münster and the coming of the Anabaptists to England, while the second alludes to Queen Elizabeth's suppression of Anabaptist émigrés. This chronological problem is usually solved by dating the composition of the play about 1538 and making allowance for later emendations. Bale mentions the Anabaptists several times in his prose writings. In *A mysterye of inyquyte* (1545) he comments on the life and martyrdom of the Anabaptist leader Peter Franke, who was burned at Smithfield on November 29, 1538. From both literary and historical considerations a careful study of John Bale and the Anabaptists should prove fruitful.

In the Elizabethan period at least two major references to seditious Anabaptists occur. In a racy piece of fiction, *The Unfortunate Traveller* (1594) by Thomas Nashe, the hero is involved with the fanatical Anabaptists in Germany. Nashe confuses the Münster event (1534-35) with the battle of Frankenhausen (1525), but it is adventure rather than facts which concern the author, although he does reveal some sympathy for the slaughtered people (see L. Feasey, "The Unfortunate Traveller" in *The Times Literary Supplement,* No. 2,435, Oct. 2, 1948). Other references to Anabaptists in the works of Nashe, as well as to separatist leaders such as John Greenwood and John Penry, can be traced by checking the index of R. B. Mckerrow's definitive edition of his works.

The interpretation of the allegory in Edmund Spenser's *The Faerie Queene* (1590-1609) provides a fruitful field of investigation. F. M. Padelford, an American scholar and authority on Spenser, has pointed out with convincing evidence that Book V, Canto ii, where Artegall debates with and destroys the "mighty Gyant," depicts the overthrow of the communistic Anabaptists in Germany (see his article, "Spenser's Arraignment of the Anabaptists," *Journal of English and Germanic Philology,* (XII, 1913, pp. 434-48). This view has gained general acceptance and is summarized in the Variorum Edition of *The Works of Edmund Spenser* (Vol. V, Baltimore, 1936; pp. 336-47). (See notes on the passage in question in Vol. V, for further allusions to Anabaptists in other works by Spenser and in Sir Philip Sidney's *The Countesse of Pembrokes Arcadia,* 1590.)

Incidental references to Anabaptists can be found in many of the major authors of the period by checking the indexes to the definitive editions of their works. In the topical allusions of Ben Johnson, Samuel Butler, and others, as well as in the vast number of theological works—both to be considered in the following sections—the scandal of sedition is rarely omitted. Writers and churchmen joined public officials in making capital of "the Munster-Business" in campaigns against both separatism and nonconformity. Baptists, Independents, Quakers, and earlier, the Puritans, were all called "Anabaptist" at various times. In this welter of incrimination the student cannot be too careful in seeking to decipher the real Anabaptists. Never was a movement more misunderstood nor more grossly misrepresented.

II. *References to Topical Anabaptism*

During the seventeenth century English Anabaptists were often considered radical Puritans, and therefore much of the satire on the larger movement may include the Anabaptists. It is the method of satire to

seize upon the most radical or extreme aspects of the subject. Here we shall only note the instances where Anabaptists are referred to by name.

In Ben Johnson's *The Alchemist* (1612) two of the characters are Anabaptists, "Tribulation, a Pastor of Amsterdam," and "Ananias, a Deacon there." This is clearly an allusion to the separatist groups who were in exile in Holland at the time. The character and piety of both men are held up for ridicule, the deacon for his blind obedience to Scripture texts and the pastor for his worldly-wise compromise of principle. Except for the specific use of the name "Anabaptist" and references to Münster there is little to distinguish these characters from separatists in general.

The English character books of the seventeenth century provide some revealing comment on contemporary Anabaptism. In these books the line between *belles-lettres* and polemical tracts quite disappears. The true character, after the classical model of Theophrastus, was a brief, witty essay, but by the middle of the century it had taken on elements of the pamphlet and broadside, even of the ballad and song. This is amply illustrated in the Anabaptist characters, if one compares the literary models of Samuel Butler with, for example, the anonymous ballad, "The Leacherous Anabaptist" (1681). The most important Anabaptist characters are doubtless those written by Butler. One of these begins: "[The Anabaptist] is a Water-Saint, that, like a Crocodile sees clearly in the Water but dully on Land." In the same author's "The Characters of Five Sectaries," written in the verse of *Hudibras,* the Anabaptist is described in the Münster tradition. The references to the practices of the Baptists are of special note. Other characters on Anabaptists were written by John Taylor the Water Poet, Francis Worthley, and some minor figures. The student will find C. N. Greenough's *A Bibliography of the Theophrastan Character* (Cambridge, Mass., 1947) more helpful in tracing Anabaptist characters than the one by G. Murphy, *A Bibliography of English Character-Books, 1608-1700* (London, 1926).

III. *Discussion in Theological Literature*

By far the most numerous and extensive references to Anabaptists, as one would anticipate, are found in theological works of various kinds. The "polemical divinity" of the long, protracted English Reformation has never been too attractive to the literary student; however, the current exploration of the sermon, for example, has created some enthusiasm. This may be due in part to the mood of our times and the greater interest, on the part of intellectuals, in orthodox Christian faith. However, many of the pamphlets of the radical reformers, with their lively and more natural style, are also worthy of literary consideration.

A convenient source of the works of many English Reformers in the sixteenth century, although selected and textually edited, is the series of Parker Society volumes published about the middle of the past century. The index volume contains three columns of references to the Anabaptists. Individual works cannot be listed here, but the writings of the following authors should be consulted: Thomas Becon, Hugh Latimer, John Hooper, John Bradford, John Jewel, John Whitgift, and Thomas Rogers. The edition of John Bale's works is most inadequate, with the result that, except for his plays, he is one of the most inaccessible of Reformation figures. Two of the most active opponents of the Anabaptists in the reign of Edward VI, William Turner and John Veron, were not included by the Parker Society. An excellent edition of John Knox's tract against the Anabaptists, *An answer to a great nomber of blasphemous cauillations*

(1560), is in David Laing, *The Works of John Knox,* 6 vols. (1846-64). The works of Catholic authors, such as Stephen Gardiner and Thomas Harding, may not be overlooked. Sometimes their references to the Anabaptists are more objective than authors in the Protestant party.

Attention must be called to the books and pamphlets in the sixteenth century which were entirely devoted to the subject of Anabaptism. There are two translations from John Calvin, *A short instruction* (1549), *An excellent treatise* (1581), and four from Heinrich Bullinger, *An holsom antidotus* (1548), *A treatise or sermon* (1549), *A most sure and strong defence* (1551), and *A most necessary and fruteful dialogue* (1551). William Turner wrote *A preseruative or triacle* (1551), and John Veron, besides translating the tracts of Bullinger and adding lengthy prefaces to them, wrote two pamphlets, *A fruteful treatise of predestination* (1561), *A most necessary treatise of free wil* (1561). Thomas Cole, himself once a favorer of Anabaptism, published a sermon which he preached against the movement, *A godly and fratefull sermon* (1553). John Hooper wrote against Anabaptist views in *A lesson of the incarnation* (1549). The book by Knox has already been mentioned. Also extant is a poem, sometimes listed as a ballad, by Edmund Becke, *A brefe confutacion of this most detestable and Anabaptistical opinions* (1550). Thomas Cottesford wrote "An epistle written to a good lady . . . wherin the Nouations erroure now reuiued by the Anabaptistes is confuted," which is appended to the same author's translation of a Zwinglian Confession of Faith, *The accompt rekenynge and confession* (1555). The letter was reprinted in 1589 and again in 1609.

All these works are against the Anabaptists. Did they not write and publish books themselves during the sixteenth century? From contemporary records there is conclusive evidence that two books, a confession of faith and a treatise on the incarnation, were both published before 1540.* No copies of these books are known to exist. The work which Knox attacks, presumably by Robert Cooche and in existence at the time only in handwriting, is also lost. (W. T. Whitley reconstructed the work on the basis of fragments from Knox. See *Baptist Historical Society Transactions,* IV, 2, 1914.) Two tracts by Henry Hart, *A godly newe short treatyse* (1548), and *A godlie exhortation* (1549), are extant in single copies. Both admonish the reader to Christian obedience and discipleship. In 1547 a tract by "I. B." appeared with the title: *A brife and faythfull declaration of the true fayth of Christ,* which contains Anabaptist views about nonresistance, the magistracy, and other points.

* Among the State Papers for the reign of Henry VIII is a report about 'Certeyn persones apprehended for the booke of Anabaptist confession.' The document contains the names of various English and Flemish persons involved in the distribution of this book and relates some of their religious opinions. No precise title of the book is given, and the document bears no date. Authorities at the Public Record Office date it at 1532, but this may be several years too early. It was printed abroad, as many English books were during this period, and must have had a fairly large run for one of the members was responsible for about 300 copies. (State Papers 1/237, P.R.O.; a summary printed in *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic of the Reign of Henry VIII,* Addenda Vol. I, pt. 1, pp. 281-82.)

The second book, a treatise on the incarnation, is referred to in a letter from Peter Tasch (Tesch), Anabaptist leader in Hesse, to Jörg Schnabel, a fellow-labourer, in prison. The seizure of the communication by the authorities was the occasion of a letter from Johann Friedrich, Elector of Saxony, to Henry VIII in 1538. Tasch's undated letter contains the following reference: 'In Engelland gait die wairheit kreftich in stille fort, der her weist wie lang. Die bruder haben ein buch offentlich in druck ausgegeben van der minschwerdung Christi. Ich habs wol gelesen. Ich freuwe mich der gaben.' (W. Köhler, et al., *Wiedertäuferakten* 1527—1626, Vierter Band, *Urkundliche Quellen zur hessischen Reformationsgeschichte,* Marburg, 1951, pp. 160-61.)

In some of the extant copies there is a second title as follows: *A bryefe and plaine declaracion of certayne sentences . . . to satisfie them that have judged me thereby to be a favourer of the Anabaptistes,* and the author then explains that he is in favor of infant baptism. This kind of "half-way Anabaptism" occurs repeatedly in the reign of Edward VI.

There is little of pure literary interest in these distinctive Anabaptist pamphlets. Of more concern in this regard is the existence of what has been called an Anabaptist play. The text is a fragment of 243 lines which has been given the title, "Love Feigned and Unfeigned." E. K. Chambers, *The Elizabethan Stage* (Oxford, 1923), Vol. IV, pp. 28-29, suggests the date of composition to be near the middle of the sixteenth century, but others have dated it as late as the beginning of the seventeenth. In form and spirit the play is a morality; the characters are named: Fellowship, Love Unfeigned, Falsehood, and Love Feigned. An authoritative text may be found in *The Malone Society Collections* (Oxford, 1907), Part I. Also see the article by E. B. Daw, *"Love Fayned and Unfayned* and the English Anabaptists," *PMLA,* XXXII (1917), pp. 267-91, where a case for Anabaptist attribution and a possible author is presented.

In the seventeenth century the theological literature written by or against the Anabaptists was so extensive that only a brief introduction can be given here. Henry Martyn Dexter, in "Collections toward a Bibliography of the First two Generations of the Baptist Controversy in England" (a supplement to his book, *The True Story of John Smyth the Se-Baptist,* Boston, 1881), lists 401 items wholly devoted to the history and doctrine of Anabaptism during the years 1618-1701, and his bibliography is far from complete. During the period of the early Stuarts and the Puritan Revolution the name "Anabaptist" specifically denoted the separatist groups later known as "Baptists" (this latter came into use in the early 1640's), while generally it was applied to many groups and views, so that the student almost despairs of trying to impose any order (see, for example, Robert Baillie, *Anabaptism, the true fountaine of Independency, Antinomy, Brownisme, Familisme, and the most of the other Errours, which for the time doe trouble the Church of England,* London, 1647).

In the major authors of the period one finds some important references. Richard Hooker, *Of the lawes of ecclesiasticall politie* (1594-1611), controverts the Anabaptist ideas of church government as well as those of Rome. Thomas Hooker, Richard Baxter, and Thomas Fuller wrote individual tracts on various doctrines of the Anabaptists. In John Milton's controversial works a number of very interesting references occur. For example, in *Angli pro populo Anglicano defensio secunda* (1654) he reproves J. More (who in 1653 had written *A lost ordinance restored)* for his use of Hortensius as a source on the Anabaptists, and helps to clear up some wrong impressions by the jibe: "But if we would call things by their names, equality in the state is not Anabaptism, but democracy, a thing far more ancient; and as established in the church, is the discipline of the apostles." (The references to Anabaptism in Milton may be checked in the excellent index to *The Works of John Milton,* New York, 1931-38, 18 vols.) An investigation of Milton and the Anabaptists ought to be worth while, for in the latter days of the Puritan Revolution he gravitated pretty far to the left. In the case of John Bunyan one may not forget that he was a Separatist minister and that his works, although of great literary interest, are primarily theological, or

rather practical admonition, in the Anabaptist sense. (See the following section for treatment of Bunyan.)

In the seventeenth century a number of continental works against the Anabaptists were translated into English. Among these were Guy de Bres, F. Spanhemius, and the anonymous author of *Apocalypsis insignium aliquot haeresiarcharum* (Leiden, 1608) (the English translation has the title: *Apocalypsis: or the revelation of certain notorious advancers of heresie,* 1658). Works such as the anonymous *A short history of the Anabaptists of High and Low Germany* (1642) and D. Featley, *A warning for England, especially for London, in the famous history of the frantick Anabaptists* (1642) represent a compilation from L. Hortensius, J. Heresbachius, J. Gast and others. There were, of course, many original works which attacked the English Anabaptists. The more important of these were: D. Featley, *The dippers dipt, or the Anabaptists duck'd and plung'd* (1644) at least seven editions in the seventeenth century; E. Pagitt, *Heresiography* (1645), also many editions; and T. Edwards, *Gangraena* (1645), a second and a third part published in 1646. The founders of the Baptist groups, Thomas Helwys, John Smyth, and John Murton, wrote many tracts which are of extreme rarity. (Most of the above works can be traced for full titles, number of editions, and location of extant copies by consulting the Short-Title Catalogues of Pollard and Wing. A useful reference work on the subject is W. T. Whitley, *A Baptist Bibliography,* London, 1916-22, 2 vols.)

IV. *Anabaptist Influence on English Literature*

Lord Eustace Percy, in a book with keen insights, *John Knox* (London, 1937), refers to Anabaptism as the "most vivid spiritual force" of the Reformation, and ventures the opinion that "the character of modern England has been largely determined by the fact that, almost alone of European countries, she offered some sort of refuge to its [Anabaptism's] eccentricities and its simple pieties" (pp. 96-7). Roland H. Bainton reached a similar conclusion in reference to the left-wing movements of the Reformation: "In Germany in the sixteenth century Anabaptism and related movements were thoroughly suppressed and never again raised their heads, whereas in England in the seventeenth century the spiritual descendants of the left wing gained a permanent foothold and did even more than the established church to fashion the temper of England and America" ("The Left Wing of the Reformation," *The Journal of Religion,* XXI, 2, April, 1941, p. 134). Such observations rest upon a certain amount of factual evidence but more particularly upon a comprehensive interpretation of the history of movements and ideas. One cannot deny the end conclusion, but it is difficult to trace the steps, to establish the genetic connections, in the process. A great deal of study and investigation is needed, but if the conclusions stated above are accepted one perceives at once the influence Anabaptism likely had on English literature. The importance of this has been hardly more than suggested.

Two examples of studies in this direction will serve to point out some possibilities. John F. Danby, a professor of English literature at Sheffield University, has noted in a critical study of Shakespeare's *King Lear* that Anabaptism may be one of the sources of certain equalitarian ideas expressed in the play. The relevant passages in *King Lear* are the prayers of both the King and Gloucester at the point where their sufferings bring them to deeper insights as to the nature of things. Their sentiments of disdain for "the superfluous and lust-dieted man" and de-

sire that "distribution should undo excess,/And/each man have enough," prepare the way for spiritual regeneration. Danby faces the problem of several possible sources: the Beghards and Fraticelli, the Anabaptists, the Christian tradition itself. There were, of course, many opportunities for Shakespeare to draw upon Anabaptist concepts. The thirty-eighth of the Thirty-Nine Articles declares, "the riches and goods of Christians are not common . . . as certain Anabaptists do falsely boast." Even a contemporary logic manual, such as Thomas Wilson's *The Rule of Reason* (seven editions from 1551 to 1580), contained four propositions about the Anabaptists. Also, as Danby points out, Shakespeare could have learned "something of Anabaptism as he learned something of machiavellism from an indignant and widespread counter-campaign." (John F. Danby, *Shakespeare's Doctrine of Nature, A Study of* KING LEAR, London, 1949, pp. 52-3, 185-89.) Danby's view, while provocative, requires a sharper statement of the Anabaptist position, and on the surface of the text one is not certain that Lear and Gloucester are advocating an equality of goods. More characteristically Anabaptist in the play is the place given to suffering, and the relation of Cordelia's rejection, defeat, and death to Lear's redemption.

Perhaps more convincing is the contention of Richard Heath that the leading concepts in John Bunyan's *The Pilgrim's Progress* (1678; Part II, 1684) and *The Holy War* (1682) are Anabaptist. Heath, a Quaker with interest in the religious but especially the "social democratic faith" of the Anabaptists, explained his views in the final two of a series of six articles on the Anabaptists, published near the end of the past century in *The Contemporary Review* ("The Archtype of 'The Pilgrim's Progress,'" LXX, October, 1896, pp. 541-58; "The Archetype of 'The Holy War,'" LXXII, July, 1897, pp. 105-18).

With the background of an account about the presence and influence of the Anabaptists in England as far back as 1534, Heath suggests that Bunyan drew his material from the sources of this tradition. The sources are not literary but concepts and a way of life drawn from a vital spiritual movement. The framework of the faithful Christian as a pilgrim is admittedly Biblical, but "if we find not only the framework but the whole texture of the 'Pilgrim's Progress' redolent of Anabaptist ideas and Anabaptist history, we shall be forced to conclude that Bunyan had always lived, unconsciously, it may be, but none the less really, in an atmosphere saturated with Anabaptist sentiments, thoughts, and traditions" (p. 544). Heath cites several passages to illustrate this view. For example, the indictment of Christian and Faithful in the town of Vanity "hits exactly the causes that lay at the bottom of the whole persecution of the Anabaptists" (p. 557). The indictment was: "That they were enemies to and disturbers of their Trade; that they had made Commotions and Divisions in the Town, and had won a party to their own most dangerous Opinions in contempt of the Law of their Prince." There can be little question that a passage such as this fits well the Anabaptist picture.

The allegory of *The Holy War* provides fuller scope for Heath's views about the social significance of the Anabaptists. Parallels are drawn with the Münster episode. The fall of Mansoul into the hands of Diabolus "is analogical in all its main points to that which in the view of the Münster Anabaptists had actually happened in Christendom" (p. 109). The recovery of Mansoul by Immanuel compares with the taking of the city of Münster. Heath's conclusion is: "The singular similarity both in the drama and in the spirit of the history and of the allegory

cannot be explained, so far as I can see, except by supposing that Bunyan had heard and assimilated the story of the Anabaptist Kingdom of Münster, and had heard it, not through distorted histories, but by the living voice of tradition" (p. 118).

Health's case for *The Holy War* is overstated and less convincing than that of *The Pilgrim's Progress.* This may be due to his great interest in the social aspects of Münster Anabaptism. At the end of the nineteenth century English scholarship had not yet fully accepted the view that Münster represented only a fringe aspect and was not typical of the larger movement. Also one ventures too far in suggesting that Bunyan's Pilgrim and City are ever to be interpreted as meaning more than the individual Christian life and soul.

The works of great literary artists are ever open to this type of observation, no doubt because they comprehend so much of truth and spiritual reality from various and divergent movements. Something of the truth of Anabaptism can be found in Shakespeare and Bunyan. But whether this is Biblical, medieval, or Anabaptist in source may be difficult to determine. It is known, however, that Anabaptism was a vital spiritual force in England contemporary with these authors, and the circumstances of their lives, particularly of Bunyan, do not exclude the possibility of causal relationships. No dogmatic answers will do. The subject deserves further study and investigation.

EDITORIAL (Continued from page 170)

Elmer Ediger, in his thought-provoking discussion, "The Mennonite Approach to Worship, and Current Trends," asks Mennonites to face the issues involved in these trends and decide whether they want to base their forms of worship on their faith. He sees, and rightly so, that the Mennonite concepts of the authority of the Bible church, the Christian life as discipleship, the Christian mission, and related concepts will and should be determinative for Mennonite worship. Taking over forms of worship growing out of other sets of beliefs, either piecemeal or in whole, can constitute a real danger to the central system of beliefs which constitute the Mennonite church. He by no means rules out esthetics; traditional Mennonite forms of worship can be improved. But such improvement dare not emasculate the faith itself, not even only symbolically. The newer trends and temptations no doubt influence some Mennonite groups more than others, but it is good that a sharp challenge be delivered against them wherever they appear. Ediger's challenge is clear, thoughtful, and convincing.

THE CONFLICT BETWEEN THE REFORMERS AND THE ANABAPTISTS WAS LONG and intense, particularly in Germany and Switzerland. Zwingli and Bullinger wrote major works against them, while Luther and Melanchthon and their Middle German and South German associates repeatedly and vigorously attacked them in pamphlets and ecclesiastical opinions for two generations. The Augsburg Confession of 1530 condemned five specific Anabaptist errors. The rulers of such Middle German states as Hesse and Saxony repeatedly requested "opinions" of their theologians and jurists. The REVIEW has published two previous articles on "Luther and the Anabaptists" and "Melanchthon and the Anabaptists." In this issue it offers two additional articles on Melanchthon and the Anabaptists, this time from the point of view of the Anabaptists. The harsh condemnation *(Prozess)* of the Anabaptists drawn up by Melanchthon, Brenz, Andreae and others in 1557, was formally answered in an important, hitherto unpublished document, the *Handbüchlein.* Wilhelm Wiswedel and Robert Friedmann give a full account of this document in its historical setting and meaning.

The Great Tradition of the American Churches. By Winthrop Hudson. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1953. Pp. 252. $3.75.

The thesis which Winthrop S. Hudson, Professor of History of Christianity, Colgate Rochester Divinity School, sets forth is that both the American churches and the political order are threatened today by the obscuring of that carefully calculated line separating church and state. This is not to say that any revolutionary or even consciously adopted set of formal principles is replacing the traditional America pattern. However, there are signs that the basic dichotomy of the ecclesiastical and the political which is implied in the "voluntary principle" of the gathered churches is being subtly undermined by the amalgamation of Christian and worldly patterns in which the churches offer no really distinctive form of behavior and no unique voice to that body of assumptions which characterize secular life. "As the vigor and vitality of the churches decline, the pressure to call upon the state for help becomes almost irresistible—the more so because it is no longer possible to distinguish clearly between the gods of society and the God of the church." The author writes primarily as a concerned member of the Christian church, but the force of his appeal is justified by political considerations as well if his claim is correct, i.e., that neither the church nor the state can function along lines which have so effectively characterized the great America tradition unless the churches accept responsibility for their own destiny by resting upon their own spiritual resources and adopting a manner of life grounded in independent theological presuppositions. Contrary to a growing sentiment, the guarantee of the separation of church and state and democratic life in general does not rest upon a dead conformity which would end in a religious, cultural, and political uniformity. Rather, that line which churchman and patriot of the late eighteenth century drew was an implication of the basic assumption of the priority of religious commitment. The disestablishment of the church in America and the adoption of the free church pattern did not stem simply or primarily from the impossibility of an agreed establishment amid the multiplicity of religious sentiments, but rather from the desire of the churches to be free from political controls.

Professor Hudson emphasizes the fact that separation of church and state in America was not thrust upon the church against its will. Although anyone acquainted with the early history of New England and the Middle States would admit that disestablishment followed a struggle within the church, nevertheless the churches "claimed independence for themselves." There were theological reasons residing deep in Calvinism and nearer the surface in the Baptist tradition. Some of the roots of separation in Calvinism are the "necessity for an explicit faith," "a skepticism of the claims of institutions," "confidence in the power of God's Word," and the responsibility of the individual for his faith and life. The revolt, of course, against a politically controlled Christianity was conducted by left-wing Puritanism, which as a revolting party saw power in independence. "A state church, the Independents maintained, tended to foster a false reliance upon an institution and a deceptive confidence in the sufficiency of a purely formal relationship to it. Furthermore, such a relationship either subordinated the church to interests of the state or created a monopoly of religion in the hands of the divines, who inevitably would be confronted with the all too human temptation to abuse their monopoly, become self-seekers, and pervert the Gospel. Samuel Richardson spoke the common mind when he contended that a monopoly in reli-

gion is to have the divine will measured out at the whim and caprice of fallible men who are apt to trim and tailor it to fit their own self-interest. It is only by free trade in religion that truth can be tested and abuses prevented."

Oddly a free religious society was created in the face of what would seem to be an entirely contradictory Puritan principle—the "holy community." Traditionally it had been accepted that a godly society could be expected only where the preaching of the Word and discipline are enforced by the state. Professor Hudson clearly shows that the church's call for separation was no relaxation of the goal of holy community in which the state, to be sure, played an indispensable role. Rather it meant that the church must draw clearly articulated lines of responsibility in which spiritual objectives would be achieved by spiritual means. Also it did not mean that the church would abandon society nor would the Christian as an individual refuse to accept social responsibility. "It was a separation of church and state; not of the Christian and society." It meant that the church would accept the responsibility of "persuading" men of the moral foundations so that responsibility would partake of the quality of the "convinced" in accordance with the "voluntary principle." Professor Hudson emphasizes the fact that a constituent principle of the "Great Tradition of the America Churches" is not separation in the sense of political indifference but one that presupposes that once separation has been established, the church will by indirect means relate itself to those problems of community which lie in the political realm. It should be remembered that the principle of separation is not the consequence of the secularization of politics but political theory grounded in theological thought.

This book is by no means calculated to give us a running commentary on the history of the American churches during the past 150 years. However, in an episodic framework, the author establishes his thesis by the description of great personalities and significant developments which comprise the great American tradition. Following the chapter describing that agonizing transition from the pattern which has characterized European Christianity for centuries to a free church system, Professor Hudson shows how the voluntary church principle was directly responsible for that flood of energy and spirit which enabled Latourette to characterize the nineteenth century as "the great century." Contrary to those fears of a loss of power and effectiveness through the disassociation of political controls and religious life, the American churches were, by the acceptance of independent responsibility and reliance upon spiritual resources, able to extend the influence of the church across the continent as well as to inaugurate the modern missionary movement. "Measured by geographic extent and the effect upon mankind as a whole, the nineteenth century was the greatest thus far in the history of Christianity" (Latourette). However, that era of expansion and spiritual aggression, the determining principle of which was recruitment by decision whether in response to a Methodist circuit rider, a great revivalist, or a YMCA leader, came to an end according to Hudson, with Moody, the "Last of the Great Revivalists." "The death of Dwight L. Moody during the last days of 1899 marked the end of an era . . . . The noble succession of Edwards and the Wesleys, of Whitefield and the Tennants, of Lyman Beecher and Charles Finney had now come to an end."

Professor Hudson characterizes the period immediately following the nineteenth century as the period of the "Princes of the Pulpit." Actually 1890 can be pinpointed as the time when the churches began to lay aside

methods which guaranteed its integrity as an independent movement and embraced culture in such a way as to obscure its own uniqueness. "The failure of the churches can almost be dated. It largely occurred during the fateful decade of the eighteen nineties, when Russell Conwell was identifying Christian virtue with alertness to economic opportunities, and sin with the opposite; when Newell Dwight Hillis was preaching on timely topics and proclaiming contradictory gospels on successive Sundays; when Philips Brooks was insisting that the church must be as broad as humanity; when other preachers were spending their time demonstrating how one could be a skeptic and a believer, or beating the drums for an increasingly jingoistic nationalism, or retreating with Charles Sheldon into the realm of romantic sentimentality." The author admits that these descriptions may be in a certain sense caricatures of these men but "they are caricatures which reveal only too clearly the unhappy truth that the churches were losing the distinctive note of the Christian Gospel and the distinctive quality of the Christian life." Of course such a development could occur only by the adoption of another theology which looked to culture rather than to God for its support and "to nurture the natural graces which were resident in every human heart." For Philips Brooks the most impressive feature of American life was "the effort of men to do outside the churches and outside Christianity that which the churches and Christianity undertake to do."

From the standpoint of cultural influence, the church was at least superficially never more effective than at the turn of the century. However, this popularity soon led to complacency. "Colleges almost universally up to 1900 and perhaps for years thereafter had been accustomed to report the number of 'pious' among the students; two decades later most of them would have had difficulty defining the term." The YMCA began to lose its evangelistic zeal; the church no longer practiced discipline; the motive for evangelism was lost in the New Theology; the churches began to justify their existence in terms of social ends; the church began to relinquish responsibility for the intellectual life of its people. Whereas the church entered the nineteenth century dominating culture through the power of integrity of separateness, it came to the end of the century in league with a culture of its own making which had actually become its master.

For those who lump Rauschenbusch with the liberal and naive exponents of a social gospel which identified a particular culture with the kingdom of God, Professor Hudson convincingly argues that Rauschenbusch demonstrates a realism and an appreciation of the power of sin and a necessity of conversion which distinguishes him as "a lonely Prophet." Rauschenbusch was so conscious of historical failure stemming from original sin and from the necessity of commitment that Professor Hudson sees in this prophet a return to the great American tradition. "The distinctive and basic elements of his message went unnoticed."

The most prophetic section of this book is the last chapter, in which Professor Hudson calls for a renewal of the churches as the way out for both church and state. This renewal can become a reality only if the churches come to a new appreciation of the "voluntary principle" and operate on these assumptions. Claiming that "in a democracy everything yields to the supremacy of public opinion and that public opinion is grounded on personal conviction," the call goes forth to the church to shape opinion by being the church. This, however, can be achieved only by the return to the "disciplined church" and an abandonment of the "open membership" or "community church" pattern. The church

must be "purified" if it is to be revived. "The present situation of the American churches is strikingly similar to the plight of New England Congregationalism after the full effects of the Half-way Covenant in terms of the indiscriminate admission of church members had begun to be felt." Even the worship of the churches is seriously affected by the heterogeneous character of its membership. However, the author acknowledges that a mere return to a moral discipline is not enough. What is required is a deep theological orientation and he feels that there are signs of this very thing. "This ebb of religious life and vitality is now beginning to be arrested and evidence is multiplying that recovery is setting in." However, the author is not convinced that those theologians who are shaping the renewal of theological interest are aware of the "obligations imposed upon them by the voluntary status of the churches in society." Too many theologians are simply "talking to one another" and there is a lack of communication outside academic circles. Those of us whose Anabaptist religious and theological orientation includes as the distinctive features such principles as separation of church and state, the voluntary principle, and church discipline cannot help rejoicing in the publication of this book. Seldom has the case been put more forcibly, and certainly it is a message which needs to be brought to bear upon the thinking of the American churches. The book, of course, is not theological in character and in that respect its value is reduced. However, the author achieves his purpose in calling our attention to the vast religious and political implications of the voluntary principle as the basic principle which formed the "Great Tradition." One might also question the selection of materials and suggest that Professor Hudson might have given more emphasis to the Baptist tradition. It is difficult to see how any book which gives some attention to the historical roots of voluntarism can completely overlook the contribution of the Anabaptists. However, such objections cannot be pressed in light of the stated purpose and very legitimate methodology which was adopted. As Mennonites we may take satisfaction in this reinforcement of our traditional position. However, it must be remembered that in advocating the principles of separation and voluntarism as the basic elements of the "Great Tradition of the American Churches" Professor Hudson includes political responsibility as a necessary and legitimate concern of the Christian church. In this respect it could be claimed that the American church pattern represents a combination of Baptist and Calvinist elements in combinations theoretically problematic but historically a fact. A Mennonite will still question whether that involvement which is implied in political participation does not inevitably denature the positive contribution of the church so as to reduce its influence to those proportions decried in this book. This brings us into the most problematic area of compromise which in spite of theological orientations so controls behavior as to obscure the moral and spiritual contributions of the church. At any rate, it is clear that what Professor Hudson is calling for is not the Mennonite approach which has traditionally seen in the separation of church and state and voluntarism the further principle of withdrawal from ultimate political responsibility. However, this reviewer feels that the modern democratic state which rests ultimately upon popular responsibility presents a unique situation for which sixteenth-century Anabaptism cannot be accepted as a final solution. This is a theoretical problem which has really not been forced upon Mennonites by reason of their small number amid a great nation.

Princeton, N.J. J. Lawrence Burkholder

Faith Active in Love; An Investigation of the Principles Underlying Luther's Social Ethics. By George W. Forell. New York: The American Press, 1954. Pp. 198. $3.75.

In this doctoral dissertation (Union Theological Seminary, New York), Dr. Forell makes a thorough investigation of the writings of Luther in an attempt to get at the real principles of his social ethic. It is the author's conviction that too much of the discussion of this subject has relied upon secondary sources in general and Troeltsch's work in particular.

The problem is created by the fact that because of his social ethics or lack of them Luther has been under severe attack by Roman Catholics, critics of Marxism, and others, and thus Luther's relation to nationalism and capitalism has to be clarified. Dr. Forell shows that neither of these movements can be attributed directly to Luther but that the conciliar movement and the ways of the papacy were more directly responsible for the strengthening of "parochialism."

The question of method is next considered. Can a methodological principle be found? Forell believes so. He does not agree with Tawney that "Luther's utterances on social morality are the occasional explosions of a capricious volcano . . . and it is idle to scan them for a coherent and consistent doctrine" (p. 45). Luther's paradoxical statements on certain matters, as for example, faith, freedom, reason, and government, have suffered repeatedly at the hands of the systematic German theology professor attempting to get Luther into his system. Luther is primarily interested in life, and not in philosophical speculation. As for a principle: "Luther's methodological principle as it applies to social ethics is functional, evaluating all ethical standards in the light of the part they play in relating man to God. It is also dynamic, constantly referring all ethics to its source in the revelation of God made possible through the Gospel of the forgiveness of sins. And finally it is objective, in its application to all men. Social ethics is for Luther not the cause, but the result of the confrontation of man by God" (p. 69).

Having discussed the methodological principle Forell treats the ethical principle. In contrast to all other ethics, especially the merit system of the Roman church and the philosophical systems from Aristotle to the Scholastics, Luther derived his ethical principle from the Bible. That principle is "Faith active in Love." Love to one's fellow men is the instrument by which faith to God expresses itself, and this love is made concrete by service.

Since Luther has been criticized most severely for the practical rather than the theoretical aspects of his ethics Dr. Forell turns his attention to the practical principle of his ethics. The practical principle he finds in the view of the natural orders that Luther expressed so often and at such great length. The Christian takes his place in the orders since they are instituted by God, and participates in them to the fullest degree since their purpose is to curb evil in the world. The Sermon on the Mount can well serve as a guide in the private life of the Christian but is not meant for the official, for in the orders reason and natural law have the final and decisive word. Luther's view of the two kingdoms is also treated in a limited way.

The limiting principle of Luther's social ethics is found in his eschatological viewpoint, which is foreshortened. Luther lived in the earnest expectation of the early return of Christ, and since the house (society) will not be used long, there is no need to go to great pains to

patch it up. Emergency bishops and the union of church and state resulted from this limiting principle in his ethics.

Anyone interested in the subject of Lutheran ethics will be most grateful for this thorough study that Dr. Forell has given us. His exclusive use of primary source materials, often translated in a fresh way by himself, while at the same time taking into account much of the secondary source material, helps to make this the best book on Luther's ethics available in any language. His clear presentation, with summaries at the beginning of the chapters, and lucid style, along with the fact that the extensive footnotes are the same size type as the regular print, make the book easily readable.

From a methodological viewpoint this reviewer would raise the question as to whether Dr. Forell has given sufficient attention to the two-kingdom view. The fact that this view has figured so largely in the discussion of Luther's ethics and has been the focus of most of the attacks by non-Lutheran theologians, but has at the same time been staunchly defended by men like Bishop Nygren, would indicate that perhaps it was dealt with in too cursory a manner. Luther's own pride in it, and the importance he attaches to it is unmistakable. He has shown the world how to respect worldly authority, how to live the Sermon on the Mount, and how one is to live in the two kingdoms, and in so doing has recaptured the essential aspects of the early church. (See his *Tischreden, Weimar Ausgabe,* 4, 4172.)

Related to the methodological question is Dr Forell's conclusion that Luther's ethical principle is "Faith active in Love." There is no question that this is correct, but what is there distinctly Lutheran about this? Here a more detailed discussion of Luther's view of the orders, the two kingdoms, and his static view of society would perhaps have focused more clearly the difference that exists between the Lutheran and Anabaptist ethic.

Regarding the limiting factor, this reviewer is not convinced that Dr. Forell has put his finger on it. If it really is eschatology, how account for the difference in ethical principles that were constitutive in the formation of the Anabaptist ethic with obviously a similar eschatology? In one you have an attenuation of the New Testament Ethic, in the other not. It is only fair and proper that Luther's ethic be examined in the light of that of the Anabaptists since he at all times desired to vindicate himself in their eyes and was confident that his answer to social questions was better than theirs. He faced the historical possibility of accepting their approach to social problems but rejected it decisively. In so doing, it would appear that not eschatology, but his basic pessimism was the limiting factor. We would agree with Luther that one can be only pessimistic when thinking in terms of human nature apart from divine grace. Luther, however, is equally pessimistic about man's response to the Gospel and apparently about its power to transform the lives of men collectively. In this we cannot be pessimistic. To be so is to cut the motivation and basis for all Christian ethics and the result is stagnation and quietism so characteristic of Lutheran ethics. Luther may boast that he has learned what it means to give Caesar his due. We may well ask whether or not he and subsequent Lutheranism have learned what it means to give God His due. The fact that twice in the past fifty years, American Lutherans and German Lutherans have faced each other in battle, both trying to give Caesar his due, would indicate that perhaps they have not.

In addition to that, it is impossible for this reviewer to see how an ethic like Luther's can be conditioned materially by his eschatology.

Why such a preoccupation with the natural orders of this world if it is soon to pass away? Why such an insistence on social responsibility and involvement if this world is soon to be in flames? Whether consciously or unconsciously, Luther's ethic was one that was conditioned, in this reviewer's opinion, far more by his view of creation and redemption, the two kingdoms, his conservativism, and his basic pessimism as to man's response to the Gospel. This latter kept him from founding a believer's church, and so his social ethic is, as Forell himself notes, highly individualistic. He cannot think of a group of Christians acting in a unified way in a given situation, doing the will of Christ. The responsibility of the Christian is as much to the secular community as to the sacred, and fundamentally Luther would see no clash between the two loyalties. The Anabaptists insisted that the claims of the secular realm must be cleared through the spiritual community, and for this reason they would not assume *ultimate* social or political responsibility.

Dr. Forell evidences much the same attitude to the Anabaptist movement as Luther had. Is it possible that he is here relying on Troeltsch or, still worse, on Luther himself? He says, "The other-worldliness of the sect (the *Schwärmer* and the Anabaptist movement with all their modern representatives) considers the state the enemy of the people and the realm of the devil . . . According to this view, the only excuse for the existence of the state seems to be that from the point of view of the all-important individual the state is useful . . . Here politics is considered by nature 'dirty' and no respectable Christian should get involved in it" (p. 24). Even a hurried perusal of some of the articles in this journal by men like Edward Yoder and Harold Bender would have shown him that at least *one* of these groups has not taken that view. Statements like that are hardly excusable when they appear in a doctoral dissertation from one of our leading seminaries.

This reviewer would agree with Heinz Zwicker that we are in need of a thorough study of the political and social ethic of the Anabaptists *(Gottesreich und Weltreich, Des Christen Stellung zum Staatsleben im Wandel der Geschichte,* St. Gallen, 1942, p. 168). This study is the more urgent since Zwicker is right in seeing in the Anabaptist approach the one that comes closest to the New Testament Christian community. It might also give twentieth century Mennonitism a clue to the principles that would help us in the social and political realm. It should begin by defying the Troeltschian categories, church, sect, and mystic, and using categories more in keeping with the facts. These categories would begin with the church's supreme task, viz., preaching the Gospel, and begin from there, not from social responsibility, a non-Christian category as it is thought of today. Those groups where the preaching of the Gospel is central would be called churches. These could then be divided into state and free churches. All groups that emphasize certain aspects of the Bible or extra-Biblical authorities more than they do the preaching of the Gospel and tend to be sectarian, that is, fissiparous, could be designated as sects. Any approach like this should be acutely aware of the vast social difference between sixteenth-century Germany and twentieth-century America. A comparison of Luther's social ethic with that of the Anabaptists is interesting in this respect. Luther's ethic is bound pretty much to his time (all but the theoretical principle, which is hardly distinctively Lutheran) whereas the Anabaptist ethic is equally valid today. Indeed, it may need to be elucidated a little more fully, but the separation of church and state, individual responsibility, responsible discipleship, and the church as a disciplined community, are as valid today as then, and

interestingly enough are being adopted by the more vigorous Lutheran bodies in America. A study such as this would further tend to dispel the apologetic air that has so often characterized the Anabaptist approach, and place it squarely in the kerygmatic atmosphere which alone can keep it vital.

On the whole, Dr. Forell's book stands on its own merits. We hope that his book is the first fruit of more books on Luther's ethic and theology that will come from the pen of American scholars. He has not set himself the task of defining and defending all the ramifications of Luther's social ethics. His task is to search for the principles that underlie it, and communicate them to his readers, by letting Luther himself speak. This the author has done superbly.

Princeton, N.J. William Klassen

Church and State in Luther and Calvin. A Comparative Study. By William A. Mueller. Nashville, Tenn.: Broadman Press, 1954. Pp. 113. $2.50.

Church and state relations have ever been problematical for both the church and the state. In the Jewish tradition, out of which Christianity arose, the religious and national community had been identical. According to Prof. Mueller, "one of the most important changes which early Christian thought brought about was the clear separation between faith and nation," a distinction which disappears or becomes obscure in the post-Constantinian era. Only after 1400 did opposing forces become strong enough to seriously challenge the church's involvement in temporal affairs and out of Catholicism's failure at self-reform arose "ecclesiastical nationalism." And because of this failure, the Protestant Reformation was inevitable.

Against this background, German-born Dr. Mueller, now professor at the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, studies the attempt of the two leading reformers, Luther and Calvin, to reconstitute the relations of church and state as a feature of their religious reform effort. Dr. Mueller is eminently qualified for the task by a thorough academic background in both Europe and America. He is fully aware of the controversies which have raged in this area between those who have insisted that the reformers were still largely medieval in their socio-religious philosophy and those who have seen them as proponents of modern views of religious liberty and the separation of church and state. Mueller follows the only course possible under these circumstances—he allows the reformers to speak for themselves regarding church and state, giving due attention, however, to what scholars holding divergent views have concluded. In so doing he has rendered a valuable service, even apart from his excellent interpretive work, because he has compiled statements scattered through their writings, many of which are not yet available in English.

It is to be expected that the author would represent the free church *(Freiwilligkeitskirche)* view, but this is not to say that he is biased or unfair. He seems fully as eager to defend the reformers as to criticize them, as the case may merit. When his findings, particularly in the case of Luther, point to the conclusion that Luther stood between two ages, as it were, and that precisely in his concept of the church and its relation to the state he was still largely medieval, one need be neither surprised nor distrubed. We are always largely the children of our time and can never leap beyond our shadow. Judging from the nature of the contro-

versy, it is to be expected that not all scholars will agree with Mueller, but it cannot be because he is not fair and objective.

From the free church point of view one might raise the question whether it is sufficient to emphasize the points of religious liberty and the assembly of believers as the criteria for evaluating the general Reformation, as Dr. Mueller has done. Should not such a study as this go beyond to include as a basis for evaluation the social ethical corollary of the free, believers' church? Or is that corollary not yet clear? Perhaps that is the case. At least when Mueller describes the Anabaptist ethic as perfectionist, it is apparent that some uncertainty or confusion still exists. If so, then it appears highly urgent that an authoritative study of Anabaptism and perfectionism be undertaken soon. For those outside the Anabaptist heritage it seems incomprehensible to say that we are not perfectionist and yet hold to a kind of ethical absolutism.

Eastern Mennonite College Paul Peachey

Im Schweisse Deines Angesichts. Ein Bilderbuch der Mennoniten. By Walter Quiring. Steinbach: Derksen Printers, 1953. Pp. 150. $2.50.

This 150-page 9″ x 11″ picture book is filled with photographs of life in all of the Mennonite colonies in Paraguay, Brazil, Argentina, Uruguay, and Mexico. In addition to photographs there are valuable maps clearly locating the Mennonite colonies. The book is the result of Dr. Quiring's recent trip to South America. After a previous trip to Paraguay from Germany he wrote the excellent volumes *Deutsche erschliessen den Chaco* and *Russlanddeutsche suchen eine Heimat.*

This book ought to have an unusually wide appeal because of the many pictures and the limited amount of reading material. It is really a collection of intimate shots of life in all of the colonies. The captions to the pictures are long enough to be more than mere identifications. They contain brief descriptions, historical notes, and often humorous comments.

It would have been exceedingly helpful to those who cannot read German if the publishers could have included English captions on many of the pictures. While pictures may speak for themselves, it is still impossible for those not reading German to identify what they are looking at. A better grade of paper would also have improved the photography considerably. Nevertheless Dr. Quiring's book is a valuable contribution to the existing information on Mennonites in Latin America and I predict will outlast most other printed works. It will become a priceless historical document in succeeding generations when the early pioneering days can no longer be described by those who have experienced them. It is the hope of this reviewer that the sale of this book will be so large that a second printing will soon be necessary. And with this hope comes the wish that such a second printing might include better paper stock and cloth binding so as to make the document more easily preserved for permanent use.

Bethel College J. W. Fretz